SUPREME COURT, U. S.

MAR 16 1968

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1967.

No. 740.

BRENDA K. MONROE, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

v.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF JACKSON, TENNESSEE, etc.,

Respondents.

APPENDIX TO RESPONDENTS' BRIEF.

RUSSELL RICE, SR.,
215 East Main Street,
Jackson, Tennessee 38301,
Attorney for Respondents.

THE GATES LEGAL PUBLISHING CO., CLEVELAND, OHIO—TEL. (216) 621-5647

INDEX.

APPENDIX TO BRIEF OF RESPONDENT.

Education in Depressed Areas, by A. Harry Passow 1b

The Neighborhood School, by Archibald B. Shaw .. 28b

Opinion Poll, October 1963, Editorial From Nation's Schools, Robert M. Cunningham, Jr., Editor .. 31b

Extract From *"Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origin,"* by Milton Myron Gordon 33b

Desegregation Creates Problems, Too, by I. N. Berlin. Reviewed in Saturday Review June 15, 1963, From *"Integration vs. Segregation,"* Hubert H. Humphrey, Editor 65b

Educational Problems of Segregation and Desegregation, by John H. Fischer, From *"Education in Depressed Areas,"* A. Harry Passow, Editor .. 71b

The Goals of Integration, by Oscar Handlin 82b

"Slums and Suburbs," by James Bryant Conant .. 105b

"Hello to Buses, Goodbye to Neighborhood Schools," by Jim Hampton From the National Observer 134b

"A Theory of Urban Education," by Robert E. Mason 141b

De Facto Segregation, a National Education Association Policy 158b

Extracts From Briefs of the United States (pp. 12, 26, 29) Filed in Brown 2 ..... 166b

Extract From Brief of Congress of Industrial Organization, Filed by Honorable Arthur Goldberg in Brown 2 (pp. 7 and 8) 167b

Extract From Brief of American Veterans' Committee (pp. 5 and 6) Filed in Brown 2 ..... 169b

Extracts From Oral Argument, Cases 1-5, October Term 1954, Vol. III, April 11-14, 1965 ..... 170b

1966 *Guidelines*—U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare 188b

EDUCATION IN DEPRESSED AREAS

by A. Harry Passow.*

(332**) The work conference united for two weeks two groups with a professional interest in the complex problems of education in centers, especially in their depressed areas.[1] One group, the conferees, consisted of "school people" with immediate and direct responsibility for operating programs effectively from day to day and for providing leadership for long-range educational planning. The second group, the speakers, included behavioral and social scientists disposed to separate from the aggregate of school problems those aspects they could study systematically. These specialists were asked to report research dealing with a particular phase of education in depressed urban areas, to present theoretical assumptions, and to confront the practitioners with the implications for educational planning. The hope was that such a bringing together of theorists and practitioners for two weeks of intensive interaction would generate, first, understanding of each other's concerns and ways of working and, second, better formulation of problems and programs.

Academic achievement and personal attitudes towards self and community—these focused much of the

---

*B.A., New York State Teachers College; B.A. (cum laude), ibid; M.A., Columbia University; Ed.D., Ibid.

Dr. Passow is Educational consultant and lecturer on education of gifted children at Teachers College, Columbia University. He is co-author of such works as: *Organizing for Curriculum Improvement, Planning for Talented Youth: Considerations for Public Schools, Training Curriculum Leaders for Cooperative Research, Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living,* and *Improving the Quality of Public School Programs.* (All published by Teachers College, Columbia University.)

** The boldface figures in parentheses throughout this appendix indicate the pagination of the original publication or transcript, and precede the pages so indicated. Emphasis throughout is in accordance with the originals.

[1] I am indebted to Mr. David Elliott for his assistance in the preparation of this chapter. Mr. Elliott's notes and summaries were especially helpful.

discussion. The most central questions were of this order: What are the significant differences between those students who do and those who do not achieve academically, have high educational and vocational aspirations, and conform to broad societal norms? What causes these differences? What will overcome the academic and other deficiencies which plague children and youth from depressed areas? What is the school's particular role of prevention and rehabilitation? There is the temptation to explain these differences solely in socio-economic terms—middle-class children achieve, in general, at a higher level than lower-class children; teachers tend to be middle-class oriented, as is the curriculum of the school. However, the conference discussions (333) rejected as too narrow and sterile an analysis which deals only with socio-economic status, only with ethnic or racial minority status, or only with in-migration and urbanization as separate and dominant stands. Some general ideas emerged from the discussions, which seem basic to many other proposals or hypotheses.

Coordinated, Multi-Level Approaches Are Needed

Many images might clarify the various distinct, interrelated levels of involvement and social organization which offer explanations, plans, and programs for overcoming gaps in individual achievement and motivation. One possibility is to view the young learner as the bullseye of a series of concentric forces which influence his attainment. With the child at the hub, the concentric spheres might be these:

The child, with his genetic potential; his experiential background; his stage of intellectual, emotional, and personality development; his attitudes and values; his self-image and view of himself in relationship to others.

The family of the child, as well as his other immediate primary (peer) groups; ethnic and racial group characteristics; newcomer or old-resident; socio-economic and educational level; family stability, including the absence

or presence of positive male models or matriarchy; extent of acculturation to urban setting.

The neighborhood in which the child and his family live; its religious, social, political, and economic characteristics; the nature of the housing available; the relationships with other neighborhoods, in the city; the sense of social health.

The school and *the classroom* which the child attends; student population, staff, program; the resources available in implementing the program; teacher characteristics and expectations; curriculum goals; the school climate.

Other agencies and institutions active in the neighborhood and the larger urban setting, such as community centers; welfare agencies, health and medical facilities, public and private; personnel, programs, organizational characteristics; working relationships among institutions and agencies; power and decision-making forces.

City and larger metropolitan area—social, economic, and political characteristics; relationships among various units and divisions within the area; relationships with surrounding areas; effectiveness in solving problems.

Larger regional, national, and international setting—social, political, economic characteristics; relation of its philosophy to local education goals and budgets.

(334) Each of these major spheres is constructed of intricate details. For example, economic conditions depend on such factors as the labor market, discrimination in employment, availability of trained personnel, automation; industrial output, over-all business developments, international conditions. The various levels are, of course, interrelated, somewhat mutually limiting and equally significant for planners, because the plans cannot be fully implemented by operations at any single level. For instance, classroom modifications by a single teacher may be futile unless supported by the climate of the school, the neighborhood, and the family.

Since planning and involvement take place at different levels, coordinated efforts are required of many

groups, agencies, and institutions. There are limits to the possible impact of a program at any level if that program ignores the multidimensions of the problems of urban life. Several papers emphasized the need for integrated planning aimed at altering the conditions in the school, the home, the community, and the urban area as a whole, involving health, educational, social, economic, political, and religious agencies and institutions in the process. This idea of "multiphase approach" does not mean that smaller, more restricted efforts are doomed to failure but, rather, that such plans must be weighed realistically in terms of their potential.

The Health and Welfare Council of the Baltimore Area sees the implications for action to capitalize on the total resources of the community as follows:

* * * it will require a *comprehensive and coordinated* approach rather than a piecemeal attack;

* * * it must envision *experimentation, integration, self-analysis, and innovation* as well as coordination and intensification of existing services;

* * * while leadership must come from those agencies which offer direct services to people, successful prosecution will require *wide community support* and commitment;

* * * if real impact upon serious community problems is to be made, *the effort must be carried beyond the area and time of a single demonstration* (2).

Differentation Between Preventative and Remedial Programs

Throughout the conference, it was emphasized that in the search for factors that influence achievement, distinctions need to be made between practices which are primarily *preventative* and *developmental* and those which are essentially *compensatory* and *remedial*. For example, at the junior high school level, academic retardation may be so severe that programs must be mainly remedial in nature, to compensate for past school failures. With the younger child in nursery, in kindergarten, or

even first grade measures are more likely to be preventative in nature, designed (335) to prepare the pupil for school achievement and the avoidance of remedial procedures. The philosophy behind a program—prevention or remedy—affects the points of emphasis, the methods to be used, the organizational arrangements and the levels of involvement.

The preventative aspects imply modifications and adaptations of programs and services to help the child hurdle his educational handicaps, cultural limitations, inarticulateness, short attention span, underdeveloped abstract-thinking abilities, lack of motivation for academic success, and similar deprivations that hobble a child's scholastic development. Unless steps are taken to compensate for these shortcomings, retardation and failure inevitably will raise a demand for remedial projects. Because success in reading and other language arts constitutes the key to academic progress, most programs stress methods, materials, special personnel, and other audio-visual and guidance services to improve as the verbal and other basic skills.

Remedial services have many different aspects. Most familiar is remedial reading instruction for pupils who lack facility in this field. Reading clinics may be established for the diagnosis and treatment of severe reading disabilities. Special service personnel of many different kinds may work either with children or with classroom teachers. For example, the New York City system assigns to schools in depressed urban areas teacher-specialists in remedial reading, science, mathematics, and core curriculum; guidance specialists, teacher trainers, Puerto Rican coordinators, behavior attendance counselors, and substitute auxiliary teachers (Spanish-speaking teachers who aid the regular classroom teachers with English instruction). Dade County, Florida, employs a team of a certificated American teacher and two bi-lingual Cuban-refugee teacher aides to work with approximately sixty Cuban-born youngsters whose English is too limited for the regular classroom. Similarly, New Haven has appointed "help-

ing teachers" who are relieved of some of their regular teaching assignments to provide leadership for a teaching team to work with a specific group of students. The helping teacher works with other teachers in the development of materials and methods of instruction. These programs illustrate how supplementary personnel can aid in upgrading reading achievement by improved instruction and remedial assistance.

The Quincy, Illinois, program of enrichment in the primary grades is essentially preventative in intent. It seeks to determine whether more time with a single teacher, an extended kindergarten day, and work with parents will make a difference, especially in reading and in attitudes toward school. Will such a program reduce the number and severity of (336) behavioral problems, preferably before they become delinquency? Many children see themselves as failures, thanks to early defeat in school. The lethargy, negative self-image, and loneliness patterns lead to further failure and eventually hostility, escapism, and aggression as the child grows older. At the kindergarten-primary level, the problems are perceived as lack of those success experiences which contribute to positive self-concepts. Early thwarting of deficiencies, it is hypothesized, may avoid the need for remedial services later.

Building Early Readiness for School Work

Several papers focused on the need for programs to develop certain intellectual, language, and learning traits in children to help them anticipate and handle school tasks. Professor Deutsch emphasized the factors in the pre-school milieu which sentence the lower-class, deprived child of impoverished family to almost certain initial failure. Thus, the negative concept of school is reinforced. Professor Goldberg suggested that the school may be the most accessible place to breach this circular negative-reinforcement process and to compensate for the ineptness toward learning.

Action guides emerged as follows: Early intervention programs, such as nursery and pre-kindergarten classes,

day-care centers, and similar pre-school arrangements should aim to promote readiness for formal school instruction. School-centered compensatory activities, from nursery through primary grades, would provide experiences generally absent from the home and neighborhood of disadvantaged children. These would attempt to offset the experiential poverty that affects what Deutsch calls the "formal, contentual, and attitudinal systems" of the child. Educators would adapt school programs, materials, teaching methods, and organization to differences in children's learning styles and cultural expectations, rather than treating all differences as handicaps and deficiencies. Various curriculum modifications aim at broadening the child's experiential base and increasing his ability to express himself verbally. Parents should be involved in an educational program beamed at a higher level of home management and child care, at increasing the parent's desire and skills for enriching the background of the child with a minimum of disruption of ongoing family life. Direct help will be channeled through pre-school curricula, possibly through increased use of educational television and other media for communicating with busy parents.

To sum up, promising ways of overcoming immaturity are embodied in enriched pre-school and kindergarten activities designed to develop auditory and visual discrimination, verbal expressive ability, sustained (337) attention, observation skills, ability to follow directions, and a generally receptive learning style. Beyond this stage, the follow-up in primary years must feature study and experimentation with revised methods for teaching reading; increased use of different materials; emphasis on verbal and symbolic experiences; small group and individualized instruction; adaptation of methods to different learning styles. Such programs may require postponement of formal instruction in favor of developing learning-how-to-learn skills and motivation for successful achievement in reading and arithmetic. The need for pre-school education of both children and parents is quite clear; the structure of such programs is not quite so clear. Preventative programs rich in materials, day-care centers or publicly

supported nursery schools, early school attendance, parent education programs, and similar efforts would demand either multi-agency coordination or a drastic expansion of present school functions. To be resolved would be the problems of funds and facilities, plus recruiting and training personnel whose roles would contrast with those of present teachers.

Speeding Acculturation to Urban Life

Professor Ravitz pointed out the cultural differences between recent in-migrants and established city residents and the consequent cultural conflicts. Just as the reasons for the various waves of immigration in the past varied, so the impetus for migration from rural areas to cities varies. Speaking of Southern Appalachian migrants, Porter pointed out that while they are white, native, Protestant Americans of several generations' standing, they are still different "in speech, in dress, in culture, in habits and mores, in education, in social status, in work experience, and in health" (4). The impact of the required adjustments may subject such a family to "cultural shock" as grim as any foreigner's.

Rural-urban migration breeds one set of problems; race and nationality create others. Ausubel maintained that ego development among segregated Negroes suffers from "differences in interpersonal relations, in opportunities for and methods of acquiring status, in prescribed age, sex, class, and occupational roles, in approved kinds of personality traits, and in the amount and type of achievement motivation that are socially sanctioned for individuals of a given age, sex, class and occupation." The psychological, emotional, attitudinal; aspirational unity of the child who grows up in the depressed area—what has been called the "slum complex"—enters the classroom. But, there are other behavioral aspects of children from depressed areas: the realities of life have matured him faster in certain respects; he may be more vigorous and spontaneous in expressing his emotions; his language may be more colorful, if less grammatical; (338) and he may

have learned the strengths which come from group support and cohesiveness.

How can the school contribute most effectively to the urbanization of the new arrival? How can it acculturate the lower-class child—teach him middle-class skills so that he can cope with the problems of living and earning a living in the middle-class-dominated city? Two answers come from Wilmington and New York. The Wilmington Public Schools project has highlighted human relations, in terms of diagnostic techniques and instruments to help children understand and develop skills as group members. The focus of classroom activities has been on helping children develop concepts about family, neighborhood, groups and community as a basis for improved behavior in social situations. The 5-year Puerto Rican Study in New York City created for teachers published guides and resource units which melded learnings about living in the city with the traditional basic skills required for success in school.

Changing the School and Neighborhood Climates

Professors Havighurst and Wilson both examined the effects of social class composition of the school neighborhood on the behavior of both the students and teachers. Both agreed that predominantly lower-class neighborhoods produce schools in which children achieve less well and have lower aspirations, both educationally and vocationally. Havighurst argued that students of the sociology and psychology of education concur that "the fact of attending a lower-class school does have something to do with the lower academic achievement of the pupils from that school." Wilson presented evidence of lower-class areas and described some of the impact of school climate as it affected the attitudes of students and their aspirations. Havighurst, concluding that neighborhoods with too low a "status ratio" (that is, too small a proportion of middle-class to lower-class children) tend to produce inferior results, suggested that planners do more to develop all-class communities and mixed-class schools. Some individuals accepted this documented evidence, but

expressed caution about the propriety and the possible consequences of the school's attempting to alter these conditions.

The school may choose from several courses of action: making drastic internal improvements to enable itself to function as a lever for upgrading the standards of the area as a whole; or serving as the catalyst for "social urban renewal." Perhaps an excellent illustration of the former approach is the Banneker Group schools of St. Louis, under the leadership of Dr. Samuel Shepard, Jr., assistant superintendent. Dr. Shepard administers the twenty-three elementary schools in one of the city's most depressed (339) areas with a population 95 per cent Negro. Except for four "borrowed" teachers who help prepare materials and charts and who participate in the guidance aspect, the Banneker program operates without extra personnel or financial resources. In a sense, Banneker is not a program but rather a continuing challenge to the entire community —children, parents, teachers, administrators, and others —to strive to do better because they are capable of doing better now.

By literally saturating the district with parent meetings, communications of all kinds, and radio programs, Dr. Shepard has influenced significantly the community's attitudes toward the importance of education and toward understanding the need for higher school achievement. In each school, assemblies, contests, field trips, and radio programs (including a mythical character named "Mr. Achiever") urge children to attend regularly and to work for higher accomplishments. Beginning with the signing of a "Parents Pledge of Cooperation," parents are advised how to help their children schedule homework time, how to provide proper facilities and atmosphere for home study, how to "get tough" about finishing homework. "Hints for Helpful Parents" itemizes suggestions for parents. Children in the area are surrounded by the motto: "Success in School Is My Most Important Business," with achievement charts for extra reminders. Non-school agencies allot homework time in their programs. Teachers are instructed to "stop teaching by the IQ score," to abandon their atti-

tudes of condescension toward the children, to keep standards high and to help the children attain high standards. Even the area merchants are enlisted; they discourage loitering and truancy during school hours and display educational materials.

Anything that will inculcate a respect for learning, enhance pride in academic achievement, boost morale of students and staff, and alert children and parents to new opportunities for Negroes is viewed as worth trying. Under the charismatic, dedicated leadership of Dr. Shepard, the schools have become the antidote for some of the defeatism of slum living. No administrative means are used to integrate the schools racially or alter the status ratio of middle-class to lower-class students. Instead, the program operates on the premise that educationally qualified individuals will find work and therefore, a socio-economic upgrading as well.

New Haven's Opening Opportunities Program involves five large-scale renewal projects which will include replacement of the city's fourteen oldest school buildings. The rebuilding involves relocation, homemaking, education, and housing programs aimed at promoting social goals. Community schools, operating 12 to 15 hours a day on a year-round basis, serving all races, creeds, and classes, will be the instruments (340) for an integrated and total approach to neighborhood needs. The school's basic roles will multiply, becoming those of an educational institution for children and adults; a neighborhood center for leisure and recreational activities; headquarters for community services such as health clinics, family and employment counseling, legal aid and other social and welfare services; and a focus of neighborhood life for confronting and resolving problems.

New York City's Commission on Integration recommended that one cardinal consideration in the selection of a site for a new school building be its effect on preserving or promoting ethnic and racial integration. Other criteria follow, such as "distance, topological features, transportation to existing school plant and pupil population destiny" plus other fiscal and real property considera-

tions. Population shifts and neighborhood changes—rapid and unpredictable—retard integration in elementary schools, particularly in the fringe areas. The "open enrollment" plan wherein youngsters from schools with heavy concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican children are transported to predominantly white, middle-class schools is still being assessed in terms of its effects on both sending and receiving schools. Professor Goldberg's paper indicated that, from the little evidence available, the gains one expects from unsegregated contacts is not automatic.

What is the critical status ratio or "toppling" point in the proportion of advantaged to disadvantaged children—in-migrant, racially different, lower-class—above which school and/or neighborhood climate changes? What are the crucial factors operating? Are efforts at changing the social composition of a school and neighborhood more promising than efforts aimed at changing only the educational program? While the regional high schools Professor Havighurst recommends are probably easier to set up than integrated elementary schools, is the secondary school too late to overcome the effects from a lower-class, segregated school in a depressed area? In his paper, Dr. Fischer argued against a school system organized primarily on racial criteria; he would provide for maximum free choice for all children, limited only by unnecessary overcrowding. Dr. Fischer was disturbed by "the growing pressure to locate schools, draw district lines, and organize curricula in order to achieve a pre-determined racial pattern of enrollment." The consequences of alternative approaches on children, families, staff and community require further study.

Curriculum Modifications Are Essential

The academic performance of children from depressed areas, so marked by scholastic retardation, demands curriculum reappraisal in (341) depth. To begin, a thorough analysis of educational goals can determine their appropriateness for disadvantaged children and youth. Does "equal educational opportunity" change its meaning when

linked to the concept of compensatory services and experiences? To what extent would these children's needs for acculturation to urban life affect the curriculum objectives? What unique aspects of urban life lend themselves to the curriculum as resources? Are goals dealing with personal and family life; with basic citizenship and social skills; with understandings of the cultural, political, social, and health frameworks more urgent for the disadvantaged child than for the middle-class child?

Americans generally resist the notions of different education for different classes, of education as the gateway to socio-economic mobility, of class barriers to educational opportunity. And yet, the idea of equal educational opportunity, the desire that all children "with their human similarities and their equally human differences, shall have educational services and opportunities suited to their personal needs and sufficient for the successful operation of a free democratic society" (1), remains a commitment for the public schools. Such an ideal of individualized instruction implies recognition and acceptance of variations in both ability and needs among the public school population.

If, despite the normal spread of educational ability, large numbers of children are not achieving, are not learning the basic skills required for academic success, are failing to develop their talents to the fullest, then educators must not lower the goals or write off blocks of children as non-achievers. McClelland, discussing the approaches used to identify gifted students, suggests that far too much emphasis has been put on talent potential as a fixed attribute. Instead, "talent potential may be fairly widespread, a characteristic which can be transformed into actually talented performances of various sorts by the right kinds of education" (3). Developing an understanding of "the right kinds of education" is basic to helping youngsters from depressed areas realize the objective of equal opportunity. The aspects of the educational program that are being modified, studied, or tested are many, affecting all levels and all elements of curriculum.

Pre-school and early childhood programs. Assuming that kindergartners' learning suffers from early impoverishment in verbal and cognitive experiences, pre-school programs for 3- and 4-year olds are being tested. Richer than the usual nursery school activity, the curriculum aims to develop cognitive and sensory motor skills, auditory and visual perception and discrimination, motor coordination, observation skills, and ability to understand and follow directions. The coordination of verbal experiences (342) and enrichment activities seeks to raise the motivation for school achievement and to enhance the learning-how-to-learn skills. In some instances, an accompanying program for mothers promotes home management and child care, as well as understanding of the educational enterprise.

Content modifications. Because the school program has such high verbal content—indeed, the child's success depends on his mastery of fundamental communication and linguistic skills—the development of reading competence and related language skills is of prime concern. A variety of techniques for teaching pupils to read are employed, including experimentation with methods, materials, groupings, and special personnel. Reading improvement teachers are used in some school systems to apply early diagnosis and corrective services. For those youngsters for whom English is a second language, special materials and techniques are being developed.

New emphasis in the elementary school is also found in such projects as Wilmington's project for schools in changing neighborhoods which stresses deepening insights and skills in human relations as a supplement to academic skills. Specific methods appropriate to the program's objectives include role playing, open-ended stories, use of film and other aids for human understanding, utilizing community resources for curriculum trips.

Special modifications have been made for potential school leavers. Among these, work-study programs, in which youth are placed and supervised in part-time jobs,

are widely used. The employment experiences are then dovetailed with work-oriented English, social studies, mathematics, and guidance experiences. The work-study approach is seen by some school systems as "an alternative pathway to adulthood" beginning with youth ages 13 and 14.

The perimeters of a program which would capitalize on the educational resources of the city, without curtailing opportunities or drive for achievement are still unclear. There are healthy elements, for example, in social studies programs which focus on urban life, which use the cultural resources of the city, and which contribute to enhancing self-image through understanding the contributions of various ethnic and racial groups to American life and culture. New York City offers family living education, as so many youngsters lack security of a sound family life and its precedents in facing their adult responsibilities. Other approaches to using the city as an educational resource include discovery of the community's social service needs and volunteer service to others.

Probably in no area of curriculum is a question so often begged as are these: What knowledge, skills, and attitudes should be acquired by youngsters (343) in depressed areas? How do these differ from the general objectives of public school programs? How can sequence, continuity, and articulation be structured for a highly mobile population? Programs in the category of so-called "basic" or "general" mathematics or "consumer" English are being increasingly questioned. However, for certain students, what alternatives are better? Not all students can or should be studying nuclear physics or fourth-year Latin, but the fact that he lives in a depressed area should not cause him to be guided automatically into vocational preparation for semi-skilled or unskilled work. As one participant put it, in developing curriculum for depressed area children, we tend to underestimate their intellectual potential and to overestimate their experiential background. Programs which open up intellectual opportunities, which are meaningful, and which are seen as contributing to both

immediate and long range development must be developed for children in depressed areas.

Curriculum enrichment. Perhaps the most widely known enrichment program is the Higher Horizons Program of New York City, now being adapted in numerous other communities. The program encourages those identified as the most able students in schools in low socioeconomic, culturally deprived neighborhoods, to develop their potential more fully and to climb to higher educational and vocational levels. Among its several aspects are remedial and enrichment services in reading, mathematics, and a foreign language; clinical services (psychological, psychiatric, and social work); a cultural enrichment program (concerts, plays, films, athletic events, field trips to colleges, hospitals, industrial plants); parent education meetings and interviews; a public information program for the community at large. Evaluation of Higher Horizons and its variations suggests positive results in such areas as reading achievement, school grades, pupil morale, improved staff morale and enhanced motivation. However, the studies raise prickly questions as well as providing answers. The need for isolating those aspects and factors which influence the program—aside from the charismatic qualities of the principal—has been noted. Whether improved instruction outweighs enhanced motivation or whether both are indispensable is unknown. Whether the enriched experiences are effective with a particular kind of child only is not known. Which facet of the program contributes which net gain is still not clear. As one conferee commented, to raise these questions is not to deprecate the Higher Horizons Program but rather to determine whether "a well-planned program of social and cultural experiences plus an improved educational program can significantly upgrade the educational achievement and aspirations of a substantial number of youngsters from deprived areas (344) or just a small core." To date, the emphasis has tended to be on those youngsters who are identified as the most promising and able.

Improved instructional materials. A great deal has been said about the need for creating instructional materials for both pupils and teachers which strike a spark in the learner from a narrow, cultural background. The major objections to much of the existing material for reading instruction, for example, are its so-called middle-class bias and its over-all blandness. Instructional materials need to be interesting, exciting, and tempting for children from depressed areas. What kinds of materials, as one participant put it, will get these children mentally out of the squalor and poverty, the imprisonment of their home environment and brighten their self-images? Out of their urban setting, some teachers have produced materials which reflect easily-recognized experiences of the children in their charge. Now available is a set of materials which weaves every-day living into reading-improvement worksheets: how to make sound purchases, how to find one's way around the neighborhood, how to locate and use community services and resources, and how to apply for a job are some of the topic treated. Functional content which deals with personal care, vocational orientation, and similar concerns seems promising. The possibilities of programmed instructional material—such as its aptness for individualized instruction, its manipulative qualities, its self-pacing—are being explored both for direct teaching-learning as well as for remedial purposes. The uses of various kinds of audio-visual and manipulative materials are being expanded.

School organization and classroom modifications. Techniques of developing divergent thinking abilities of inarticulate youngsters indicate another trend in instructional emphasis. The emphasis is on encouragement of children to think outside the conventional verbal channels and to use intuitive thinking, curiosity, exploration, and guessing rather than memorized rote verbal responses.

Some schools are experimenting with team teaching arrangements of various kinds as well as block time arrangements. Ungraded primary units are being tested as to their effects on disadvantaged children. Pittsburgh's

Team Teaching Project is designed to cope with the problems of "excessive mobility of population served, a high rate of teacher turnover, and the depressing cultural and socio-economic conditions in some of the areas from which their pupils come." By using different-sized teaching teams to work with classes and groups of various sizes, by drawing on personnel resources from the community, educational experiences are being extended and brought to life. Some instruction takes place in groups of 70 to 120 pupils; elsewhere, small groups of five to fifteen concentrate (345) on subjects in which they require special help or have unusual ability. Varying in purpose and emphasis, four kinds of teaching teams have been organized for the primary, intermediate, special subject and junior high school areas. A mental health team enrolls a psychiatrist, two psychiatric social workers, two school social workers (home and school visitors), a clinical psychologist and a research consultant. This team has been organized for the early identification and referral for therapy of children with emotional and social handicaps which inhibit their learning. Finally, social agencies, educational and religious institutions, civic and welfare organizations, and governmental units help provide personnel, facilities and funds which complement and undergird the educational effort.

The ungraded primary unit and its offshoots gear their pace to individual ability, in an effort to insure continuous progress for a child or at least to reduce the trend of failure for the youngster who moves haltingly. The unit generally treats the first through third grades as a block with grade lines eliminated so that the youngster may spend as few as two or as many as four years in the primary grades, progressing as he is able to, without being retarded.

Diagnostic and remedial programs. Like the Pittsburgh Mental Health Team, programs are being initiated in other cities to diagnose learning difficulties as early as possible in order to help prevent handicaps or disabilities. New York City's Early Identification and Prevention Pro-

gram, for instance, typifies efforts to identify, as early as possible, children with problems of emotional or social adjustment. Here again, a functioning team aims to clarify the scope and nature of the child's problems and to foster the kind of mental health, educational climate, counseling and treatment services that will reduce potential incidents. Prime attention is for children with reading problems; diagnostic procedures refer such youngsters to various clinics and agencies. Lack of adequate facilities in school and community, which aggravate the urgent need for more remedial services in all curriculum areas, is a need recognized by educators in most cities. Most pressing, perhaps, are the reading and special programs, such as additional classes for disturbed youngsters who can only remain in school if special assistance and instructional arrangements are made.

Reading clinics are available in many cities for youngsters who are too retarded to be helped either by the classroom teacher or by supplementary reading personnel. Staffs usually include selected teachers functioning as reading counselors, plus a clinical team consisting of psychologist, social worker, and psychiatrist. In New York City, to be referred to (346) such clinics, children must be of normal intelligence although severely retarded in reading.

Additional staff. Extra personnel are being assigned to schools to help children, classroom teachers, school administrators, and parents; to increase remedial and diagnosis activities as well as referrals; and to work with home and community agencies. Some of the special personnel found in the schools of New York City, for instance, include these:

Reading improvement teacher—relieves the classroom teacher for reading instruction, assists new and probationary teachers with reading instruction methods and materials, assumes responsibility for classes in schools where teachers have had to forego full lunch periods.

Other teaching personnel—provides remedial reading help in schools with large groups of non-English-speaking

pupils, teaches English as a second language to small groups of children in part- or full-time classes.

Non-English-speaking coordinator — helps other teachers improve the learning techniques and general adjustment of non-English-speaking pupils.

Substitute auxiliary teacher—links the school with the home, particularly of non-English-speaking pupils.

Junior guidance teacher—instructs children with normal intelligence who reveal patterns of serious social or emotional adjustment; works with psychologist and guidance specialist to determine whether the child can be helped or needs to be institutionalized.

Teacher of children with retarded mental development (CRMD)—works with small units of mentally retarded children in a self-contained classroom.

Teacher-trainer—works with newly appointed or probationary teachers on a helping-teacher basis.

Detroit has added coaching teachers to support the work of the regular teachers by their extensive diagnostic, remedial and developmental work in the language arts and arithmetic; full-time visiting teachers (school social workers) to diagnose and refer pupils and their parents for aid from appropriate agencies and specialists; school-community agents to provide liaison between the school and its community, parents, other adults and agencies. Other cities have increased available personnel for specific services for children in depressed areas, services which are usually of compensatory or remedial nature.

Extension of school day. Schools in depressed areas have long served as neighborhood reacreation and leisure-time centers. Some school systems are going beyond the usual after-school recreation programs and are providing (347) places for individual and group study, reading and science centers, cultural enrichment centers. The after-school program is viewed as more than a day-care or custodial activities and, instead, presents schools with enrichment centers for children and youth, as well as adults. The community-school concept—using the school plant for co-

ordinated community services with programming from early morning to late evening, 7 days a week, 12 months a year—is extending into depressed areas more and more.

In New York City, the Mobilization for Youth Homework-Helper Projects employs high school youth from low-income families as tutors for elementary school youngsters with academic problems. The tutor is paid on an hourly basis, which yields a small income for after-school work. Selected grade-school pupils attend after-school tutoring sessions on a one-to-one basis. The high school students are trained for the work and are supervised by adult teachers. The high school tutors are not expected to provide remedial help but they do contribute the extra reassurance, support, and immediate impetus for helping elementary scholars with their studies, especially in the language arts area. The program has the dual virtues of recognizing and rewarding concretely high school students who are achieving and of helping culturally disadvantaged children with their school work.

After-school programs will continue to feature recreational and informal pursuits, civic meetings and performances of various kinds, but the expansion of these into culturally enriching activities will enable some youngsters to escape from the slum society into the centers for support, entertainment, instruction, and social intercourse.

Extension of school year. Several kinds of programs are lengthening the school year. One is a schedule change using a 12-month program with all of the implied modifications in staffing, programming, and facility use. Widespread is the practice of school's operating summer programs and camps. The summer school may be an extension of the normal academic program to enable youngsters either to make up for past deficiencies or to enjoy advanced work or other forms of enrichment. Normally, students at the elementary school level are invited to attend without credit, marking, or formal examination but rather to experience educational growth. The primary objective of summer-school programs in the depressed

areas is more usually that of enrichment and remediation. The atmosphere can be less formal, particularly if advantage is taken of day-camp possibilities for school activities. Here, the program can be enriched within and outside of the building, drawing heavily on the camping approach. Some school systems are operating summer residence camps (348) for youngsters from depressed areas as a means of getting them away from the city and from disadvantaged neighborhoods. A low-cost camping program and outdoor recreational experiences are combined with academic and educational opportunities in such arrangements.

Extended guidance and student personnel services. Increased guidance and counseling services are found mushrooming in many depressed area schools. Team approaches to working directly with youngsters on a counseling or therapy basis are involving guidance specialists, social workers, psychologists, and classroom teachers. Often, services are being extended to the family to help parents better understand the educational program and their own children's behavior and achievement. Guidance services have been scheduled for the evening hours and summer months to make them more readily available to depressed area families. Non-school people with competencies in particular vocational or professional areas are supplementing the more traditional guidance services. Student personnel services are one of the prime areas in which diagnostic and counseling services are being extended to reduce clinical needs of youngsters from depressed areas.

Work-study and continuation programs. Keeping youngsters in school so that they do not join the dropout statistics is no longer viewed as an adequate goal by most school systems. Instead, secondary schools are attempting to develop retention programs which are meaningful, which are perceived as contributing to the youth's personal and vocational goals. An illustration of the concentrated efforts in New York City to retain high school students is found in the Youth Achievement Program.

Boys with records of truancy, poor behavior, and academic failure are grouped together under the full-time guidance of an experienced, sympathetic teacher. Besides two regular-program classes, the boys attend a two-period class with their special teacher who uses curriculum materials designed for the group. In the afternoon, they work at part-time jobs for private employers with the special teacher responsible for job placement, job visitation, and contact with the home. Their curriculum materials emphasize job orientation and preparation for adult responsibilities.

Work-study programs, by giving equal importance to academic achievement and work skills, increasingly are viewed as the means for secondary schools to hold youngsters with meaningful, gainful experiences. Particularly important for alienated youth, this practice is catching on also for preventive programs. The Detroit Upgrading Program provides a short-term work experience for out-of-school unemployed youngsters, combined with in-school instruction. Other projects modify school programs to combine continuation of academic work with pre-employment instruction. Such programs equip youngsters with information about (349) work tasks and training standards and aims at stimulating the academic achievement prerequisite to job success. Courses include work-sampling, trips to plants and stores, and classroom visits by local employers. The field trips are designed to launch discussions about training demands, rewards, opportunities, and personal satisfactions. There is close scrutiny of the role of trade unions and various legal and quasi-legal organizations whose purpose it is to upgrade workers and eliminate discriminatory practices.

Work explorations, on-the-job training, subsidized work experiences are all being arranged along with programs to convince youth of the need for education. Efforts are being made to offer a climate conducive to more school for the drop-outs, at least on a part-time basis. The 16-to-21-year-old group is particularly critical; thus, the post-high school technical training and job retraining are both

seen as promising practices. Basic education for individuals with technical skills but threadbare educational qualifications represent another facet of school retention or continuation efforts.

Parent education programs. The need for interpreting to parents the school program and its stress on educational achievement and motivation has resulted in the transfer of some parent education programs from school to home and neighborhood. School systems have found parents of children in depressed areas indifferent and apathetic, rather than hostile to education. Frequently, such parents are uncomfortable in the presence of a teacher or a person who represents authority. Many would be glad to have their children achieve, but—having had little formal schooling themselves—they know little about the whole process or how they can assist. Some school systems are attempting to reach parents by informal, apartment-house-based programs rather than the formal, structured, parent-association approach. These programs seek to help parents directly and practically with their day-to-day problems and to avoid dealing with general discussions about child care.

New methods of instruction. Relatively little research has sought to pinpoint methods that reach culturally disadvantaged youth. Many kinds of reading instruction methods are being tested for their contribution to developmental and corrective needs of children in depressed area schools. However, little is known about what methods will contribute to a more trusting relationship between pupil and teacher, will provide for variety and motility, will modify the need for immediate gratification, will contribute to overcoming the specific learning disabilities of depressed area children. The particular teaching procedures that influence classroom climate have not been clearly seen as yet. Experience has shown that some teachers succeed better than others with pupils in disadvantaged (350) areas. It would be invaluable to know more about the constellation of forces which contribute to this differential success: how much is due to personality,

including the ability to be supportive and accepting, imaginative and creative; is "middle-class oriented" teaching necessarily a negative factor or can it effect growth positively; how does the teacher reach the hard-to-reach youngster? Study may yield some leads to methods, tempo or pacing of instruction, attention span, involvement, and emphasis on different sensory modes as they effect pupil attainment and drive.

Coordinated efforts among youth-serving agencies. The duplication of effort, overlapping of services, lack of coordination, and failure to share information continue to plague various social and welfare agencies in many a community—particularly in depressed areas. Several projects are using the school as the catalyst for coordinating efforts amongst the educational, social, municipal, and service agencies.

In-service teacher and staff training. Almost every educational upgrading program involves some kind of in-service training of teachers to equip them to meet the challenge of working in depressed areas. These training sessions may aim at wakening the teacher's sympathy and understanding of the cultural heritage, economic and social problems and individual life styles of pupils in depressed areas. Beyond that, in-service programs attempt to help the teacher directly with methodology, subject matter, instructional resources, methods, classroom management and the availability of special services in depressed areas. The potential rewards and personal and professional satisfactions which come from working with disadvantaged children are stressed.

In conclusion. The multi-dimensions of the problems of education in depressed areas and the various efforts to give meaning to the ideal of equality of opportunity demand unclouded perspective, a prophet's eye for planning, and a predilection for the larger context. The above listing of various efforts to improve education and life in depressed areas represent a sampling only and is neither comprehensive nor qualitatively selective. They simply illustrate the many ways to attack the complex and crucial

problem. Agreeing that more and better research and experimentation are needed, the social and behavioral scientists will certainly be increasing the production of studies and their complexity. Educationally, the gaps are awesome in our understanding of the factors whose total is cultural deprivation and its consequences. What are the effects of various social and psychological factors on the attitudes of different groups toward the schools and toward education? The importance of looking at the problem in terms of its educational, sociological, psychological, economic, political, health, welfare and housing dimensions is (351) increasingly clear. Knowing that the decision makers or the influentials must become involved, we do not know how to attract their commitments nor how to organize the unaffiliated in the depressed area so as to increase the indigenous leadership.

During the conference several expressions were repeated over and over again:

"We need more data . . ."

"We need to test . . ."

"How will this affect other programs if . . ."

"Where will the teachers come from to . . ."

"With limited resources, would it be more profitable to . . ."

"Where will the money come from for . . ."

Over and over, participants stuck on the question of whether the school alone can make the necessary impact without society's opening up really equal opportunities in employment, in housing, in civic affairs. The importance of full and equal employment opportunities cannot be overemphasized and is directly tied to educational attainment. We need to know much more about the nature, the consequences, the effects of the total societal milieu on educational opportunity. We need to know how each of the subfactors interacts with others to create the conditions for equal opportunity. We need to capitalize on the positive elements of life styles in the depressed areas, of ethnic and racial minority groups, of the city as an

educational center in order to move ahead purposefully and unitedly to overcome the disadvantages of millions of Americans.

The outlook is both discouraging and hopeful. It is discouraging in terms of its size, complexity, bitterness, and the human cost involved. The outlook is hopeful in the forces which are being mobilized to dissect and resolve this wasteful, destructive problem of displaced citizens in a rejecting or ignoring homeland. The ideal is clear, the directions well marked; now, the initial steps must be taken so that Americans all can move ahead toward the fullest realization of each individual's potential.

REFERENCES

1. Educational Policies Commission, *Education for ALL American Youth: A Further Look,* Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1952, p. 29.
2. Health and Welfare Council of the Baltimore Area, Inc., "A Letter to Ourselves: A Master Plan for Human Redevelopment," Baltimore: the Council, January 18, 1962, p. 5.
3. McClelland, David C., "Issues in the Identification of Talent," in David C. McClelland et al., *Talent and Society,* Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1958, p. 25.
4. Porter, E. Russell, "When Cultures Meet." Cincinnati, Ohio: Mayor's Friendly Relations Committee of Cincinnati, May 1962, p. 1.

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

by Archibald B. Shaw.*

Every custom and principle in our public schools needs to be looked at critically under today's pressures. Class size, school size, pupil-teacher ratios, grouping, grades—nothing is sacrosanct. Any kind of organization has faults and sets limits, by definition. We need a fresh view to see whether they are still valid, lest we confuse tradition with revealed truth and change with heresy.

One of the longest and stoutest-held traditions is that of the neighborhood school. Now it has come under attack, and deserves the most careful scrutiny.

The neighborhood school has two built-in characteristics—it limits children's contacts and it takes on much of the flavor of its neighborhood. These two factors can work for good or ill. A third characteristic, usual but not inevitable, is that which was exposed beyond dispute in Patricia Sexton's study of a big city's schools—the poorer the neighborhood the poorer the school. This doesn't have to be so.

Experience and good sense tell us that even the same dollar expenditure at each school won't equalize educational opportunity. More is needed. Just as we cheerfully accept the obligation to provide more and better lighting for people with handicapped vision, we need to provide more in school for those children who have less out-of-school educational stimulation.

---

* Contributing editor, *American School University,* Vol. 36 (Dec., 1963) p. 9. Dr. Shaw is Associate Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators. He received a B.S. degree from Bridgewater State Teachers College, M.Ed. from Boston University, M.Ed. from N. Y. University School of Education, and Ed.D. from New York University. Dr. Shaw has been a teacher, Principal, Scout Executive, Assistant Superintendent. He is the former editor of *Overview Magazine,* and American School and University Yearbook. He has contributed to such professional publications as: *School Executive, The Nation's Schools, Clearing House, Childhood Education, American Association of School Administrators Yearbook,* and *American Scholar.*

There are places where school attendance boundaries need sharp re-study. A few schools can be unsegregated by boundary shifts. In a few districts it is possible to re-group the grades so that two schools may share a double-neighborhood, one for grades 1-3, one for 4-6. Ingenious and inspired remedies may be possible. But for most school systems there is no real choice. The elementary schools must be neighborhood schools or become mechanical sorters of kids and purveyors of a kind of robot education.

It is not only distasteful and un-American to try to compartmentalize kids according to some pre-established religious, color and culture mix. It is futile. People who are now more mobile than ever before just won't stay put. The result too often has been a rapid re-segregation, and a general lowering of educational opportunity for all.

To one view, the scrambling of kids by some impossible formula destroys the potential of the neighborhood school for every neighborhood and doesn't yield genuine gain for anyone. To such a view, neighborhoods and their sociology are all that stand between us and a mass, de-humanized, overpowering society.

It's not enough to be on record for the neighborhood school. City officials, school boards, and school people must accept the accompanying challenge to make that school a genuine service center and a haven of real educational opportunity for the neighborhood, tailored in its resources to fit the task.

The fundamental complaint in the slum schools is not against segregation but against inadequate, inappropriate, and ineffective education. Superintendents aren't to blame, nor are school boards. The situation has grown on us all, as a part of the decay of downtown. Strangely very few urban planners, renewal experts, or other apostles of the new city have recognized the potential of a truly neighborhood-serving school for the lifting of the quality of living in a decaying area.

In fact a great deal of public housing has contributed to the anonymity and extinction of the neighborhood as

a social organism. Much of it has posed impossible conditions on a city school system which might, had it been given a chance, have been able to soften the brutal impact of the housing units and at least have been ready with adequate schools as they were needed. But schools have not had that chance. Neither has their over-all access to the city and area tax resources kept pace with the problem.

The problem is with us, in cities large and small; all over the nation. Destroying the neighborhood-serving school is not the answer. What is needed is the will and wisdom, to mount a concerted attack on the deficiencies of the neighborhoods and to make drastic improvements in the appropriateness and effectiveness of their schools. This takes a lot of doing. Most of all it takes a realistic level of financial support comparable to that provided now only in the wealthiest, most school-conscious suburbs. It's not just a city problem. The amount of money now available to try to do some of these things is a national disgrace.

OPINION POLL, October 1963.

Editorial from Nation's Schools,
Robert M. Cunningham, Jr., Editor.

KEEP NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL, 84 PER CENT OF SCHOOLMEN PLEAD

Nine-tenths of this month's replies heartily disapprove student transfer to correct de facto segregation; even in the face of court rulings, most administrators favor neighborhood school

Nine out of ten schoolmen across the country think that de facto school segregation in Negro neighborhoods does not warrant transfer of students to schools outside their neighborhoods. This opinion was recorded in October's poll of administrators. And almost as many administrators (84 per cent) would adhere solidly to a neighborhood school concept as a policy.

A Pennsylvanian expressed himself this way: "I do not believe public schools should be made the 'whipping boys' for desegregation." Another voice of the majority found fault with what he considers imposing of political will: "I believe strongly in equal opportunity in education for all ethnic groups. I feel, however, that integration, as imposed, is political rather than educational." (N.Y.)

Ranking high on the list of reasons for not condoning student transfer where de facto school segregation exists was the money shortage problem faced by most districts. Many administrators consider the cost of transporting students economically out of line. In the words of a Wisconsin administrator: "Transportation costs are high enough now and funds should not be diverted from instructional services." A New Yorker said: "This whole thing is ridiculous! In some cities we can't get enough money to buy books for children. Yet it is proposed—even ordered—that the district transport children from one section of the city to another." Another schoolman from Wisconsin offered this suggestion: "If the schools that Negro children attend are in as poor shape as Negro leaders contend, the

money spent transporting the students might better be spent improving their present schools."

Among those who thought it was a good policy to transfer Negro students out of neighborhood schools (9 per cent answered Yes) was an Oklahoma superintendent: "Transfers would vary with the individual school. Some schools will have children who desire a type of training not offered in their neighborhood, and they should be transferred."

Regardless of recent court decisions that minimize the importance of the neighborhood school, most administrators hold the opposite view. Reasoning behind this opinion was summed up by an administrator in Alaska: "Schools should be neighborhood centers for children and adults. If attendance areas are scattered this will also tend to break up the neighborhood spirit."

Speaking from his personal experience as an administrator in integrated schools, a superintendent from Oklahoma said: "I am for segregation regardless of the cost of extra buildings and transportation. I have had one integrated school and will not take another."

HOW ADMINISTRATORS VOTED

1. When housing patterns produce de facto school segregation in Negro neighborhoods, do you believe the district should transfer students to schools outside their neighborhoods?

Yes 9% **No 91%**

2. In view of recent court decisions minimizing the importance of the neighborhood school, do you favor adherence to a policy that requires children to attend schools nearest their homes?

Yes 84% **No 16%**

Based on a 4 per cent proportional sampling of 16,000 school administrators in continental United States, this survey brought a 35 per cent response.

Extract from "ASSIMILATION IN AMERICAN LIFE: THE ROLE OF RACE, RELIGION AND NATIONAL ORIGIN"

by Milton Myron Gordon.*

(233)

8. Assessment and Implications for Intergroup Relations

We are now ready to assess the meaning of the foregoing analysis for the field of intergroup relations. As noted on the opening page of this volume, we are concerned ultimately with problems of prejudice and discrimination; however, our study has focused directly not on individual psychological states and activities related to ethnically prejudiced behavior, but rather on the nature and structure of group life itself in the United States. We have pursued this line of analysis not out of a conviction that individual psychological states are unimportant in explaining the phenomena under consideration but rather because of a firm belief that group life and social structure constitute the matrix in which cumulative psychological states are embedded, that the latter cannot be thoroughly understood without reference to the former, and that social structure and group life have been relatively neglected as dynamic factors in etiological analysis of racial and cultural prejudice.

To put the matter in another way, one may consider racial and cultural prejudice in America in two different contexts. One is to think of 190 million American individuals, some of whom happen to be v ite Protestant, some white Catholic, some Jewish, some (234) Negro, etc. We then ask why some of these individuals are ethnically prejudiced and others not, or only partly so, and then concentrate on studying the personality syndromes (and their

---

* Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Massachusetts. A.B., Bowdoin College, Md., Ph.D., Columbia University. Dr. Gordon is Professor of Sociology at the University of Mass. His special fields of interest include Race Relations, social stratification, and sociological theory.

etiological roots) of the various types along the prejudice continuum. Much valuable research has been carried out along these lines. Our inquiry has been substantially different, although the two approaches can be considered complementary rather than competing or mutually exclusive. We have chosen to focus on the nature of group life itself in the United States as constituting the social setting in which relationships among persons of differing race, religion, and national origin take place. For these 190 million Americans are not just individuals with psychological characteristics. They belong to groups: primary groups and secondary groups, family groups, social cliques, associations or formal organizations, networks of associations, racial, religious, and national origins groups, and social classes. And the nature of these groups and their interrelationships has a profound impact upon the way in which people of different ethnic backgrounds regard and relate to one another.

In particular, we have called attention to the nature of the ethnic group itself as a large subsociety, criss-crossed by social class, and containing its own primary groups of families, cliques, and associations—its own network of organizations and institutions—in other words, as a highly structured community within the boundaries of which an individual may, if he wishes, carry out most of his more meaningful life activities from the cradle to the grave. We have pointed to the considerable body of evidence which suggests that the various ethnic varieties of Americans, excepting the intellectuals, tend to remain within their own ethnic group and social class for most of their intimate, primary group relationships, interacting with other ethnic and class varieties of Americans largely in impersonal secondary group relationships. The United States, we have argued, is a multiple melting pot in which acculturation for all groups beyond the first generation of immigrants, without eliminating (235) all value conflict, has been massive and decisive, but in which structural separation on the basis of race and religion—structural pluralism, as we have called it—emerges as the dominant

sociological condition. The implications of this analytical description of American group life for intergroup relations will now occupy our attention. The following remarks will vary considerably in the generality of their theme and the specificity of their conclusions and recommendations. Furthermore, they will, from time to time, call into play certain ideological premises which will at such times be carefully identified. With these considerations in mind we are ready to proceed to a discussion of the implications of our analysis seriatim.

Structural Separation, Functional Consequences, and Prejudice: Recent studies have pointed to the role of intimate equal-status contact between members of majority and minority groups in reducing prejudice.[1] Structural separation, by definition, denotes a situation in which primary group contacts between members of various ethnic groups are held to a minimum, even though secondary contacts on the job, on the civic scene, and in other areas of impersonal contact may abound. In view of the tendency of human beings to categorize in their psychic perceptions and reactions and to form in-groups and, frequently, out-groups on the basis of familiar (236) experiences and contacts,[2] it may be plausibly argued that just as intimate primary group relations tend to reduce prejudice, a lack of such contacts tends to promote ethni-

---

[1] Samuel A. Stouffer, Edward A. Suchman, Leland C. DeVinney, Shirley A. Star, and Robin M. Williams, Jr., *The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life*, Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1949, pp. 586-95; Morton Deutsch and Mary Evans Collins, *Interracial Housing*, Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press, 1951; John Harding (ed.), "Intergroup Contact and Racial Attitudes," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1952; Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Cambridge, Mass., Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954, pp. 261-82; Daniel M. Milner, Rosabelle Price Walkley, and Stuart W. Cook, *Human Relations in Interracial Housing: A Study of the Contact Hypothesis*, Minneapolis, Minn., University of Minnesota Press, 1955; George E. Simpson and J. Milton Yinger, *Racial and Cultural Minorities*, New York, Harper and Brothers, Rev. Ed., 1958, pp. 751-7.

[2] Gordon W. Allport, op. cit., pp. 17-67.

cally hostile attitudes. It should be carefully noted that we are not thereby concluding that prejudice and discrimination cannot be reduced under conditions of structural pluralism; nor, indeed, that structural pluralism is necessarily undesirable from a philosophical point of view. Obviously, even from a sociological viewpoint, the matter is one of degree and should be discussed in that context.

On the one hand, structural separation of ethnic groups, brought about in part by the prejudices of the majority and in part by the desire of most such groups to maintain their own communal identity and subculture, can proceed to a point which is dysfunctional both for the creation of desirable attitudes and relations between the groups and for the workable operation of the society itself. The operation of modern urbanized industrial society is predicated upon the assurance of the easy interchangeability and mobility of individuals according to occupational specialization and needs. The fulfillment of occupational roles, the assignment of living space, the selection of political leaders, and the effective functioning of the educational process, among others, demand that universalistic criteria of competence and training, rather than considerations based on racial, religious, or nationality background, be utilized. The subversion of this principle by ethnic considerations would appear bound to produce, in the long run, confusion, conflict, and mediocrity. American society has not moved as far in this direction of "compartmentalization" or "columnization" as have certain other countries such as Holland and Lebanon,[3] but

---

[3] Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor*, op. cit., pp. 326-30; and David O. Moberg, "Social Differentiation in the Netherlands," *Social Forces*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (May 1961), pp. 333-7. On the question of dysfunctional consequences of excessive pluralism in the Netherlands, see Moberg, pp. 334-7. The following quotation is instructive: "Community solidarity and efficiency [in the Netherlands] are diminished. Not only is group set against group in political affairs, but even when there are community-wide activities with cooperative planning there must nearly always be representation from all major confessional groupings of the com-

(Continued on following page)

a trend toward this (237) type of structural organization in America may well be in the making. As Lenski has cautioned, after surveying the data from his study of socio-religious groups in Detroit:

> Currently we seem merely to be drifting into a type of social arrangement which Americans of all faiths might well reject if they became fully aware of all it entails.
>
> This problem should be of special concern to religious leaders. Our current drift toward a "compartmentalized society" could easily produce a situation where individuals developed a heightened sense of religious group loyalty combined with a minimal sense of responsibility for those outside their own group. In a more compartmentalized society there is good reason to fear a weakening of the ethical and spiritual elements in religion and a heightening of the ever dangerous political elements. Such a development would be a serious departure from the basic ideals of all of the major faiths in America, sharing as they do in the Biblical tradition. Hence, on both religious and political grounds, Americans might do well to study more critically than they yet have the arguments advanced by advocates of pluralistic society.[4]

With regard to prejudice itself, it would seem reasonable to conclude that excessive compartmentalization or structural separation, since it prevents the formation of

---

(Continued from preceding page)

munity. As a result, incompetence is often evident; considerations of religious politics are placed above competence in the appointment or selection of personnel for community organizations and committees. Even when federated activity cuts across the religious columns, actual association of persons with different religious views takes place only among the small proportion of the population which holds positions of leadership. 'Water-tight' partitions separate the rank-and-file members." (Moberg, op. cit., p. 336).

[4] Lenski, op. cit., pp. 329-30.

those bonds of intimacy and friendship which bind human beings together in the most meaningful moments of life and serve as a guard-wall against the formation of disruptive stereotypes, sets up the conditions under which ethnic prejudice will grow and flourish. It is possible that even a (238) modest degree of structural separation will tend always to have as a sociological concomitant a low, endemic degree of prejudice among the various ethnic groups (varying considerably, of course, for individuals). This is by no means a counsel of despair and is in no way meant to discourage the attempts to combat prejudice and discrimination by those standard means currently being used by various agencies, private and public. At the very least, however, it suggests that one may not be able to eat *all* of one's cake and have it too, and it puts high on the agenda the carrying out of research focused on the causal relationship between degrees and types of structural separation and the holding of ethnically prejudiced attitudes. It makes mandatory, too, careful consideration by those ethnic agencies, institutions, and officials (of whatever religion, race, or nationality) of the desirability of program and policy measures calculated to produce a heightening of the level of structural separation now existing among the various ethnic groups in America. Furthermore it raises questions about the ultimate desirability of the acquiescence by manifestly community-wide civic agencies and programs (of which the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts are salient examples) in organizational segregation at the local level according to religion, as a result of the stipulations of religious communal leaders and officials.

The characteristic disclaimer by denominational communal leaders that "We want our people to participate actively in *both* denominational organizations and activities *and* community-wide organizations and affairs" must be measured against the simple reality that people's time and energy are not infinite in extent and, in fact, are bounded by substantial limitations. If the ordinary citizen is continually exhorted by his ethnic leaders to participate

unreservedly in the ever-expanding array of ethnic-enclosed communal institutions springing up at all age levels, he will, in fact, have little or no resources of time and energy left to participate in those agencies and activities of the broader community that (239) through their broader perspective and membership bind the religious, racial, and nationality groups of America into a viable nation—a nation that for reasons of both sociological health and traditional political ideals must strive to be substantially more than an instrumental federation of mutually suspicious ethnic groups.

Structural and Cultural Pluralism: Legitimation and Relationship to Democratic Values: Although we have just finished warning of the dangers of an excessive degree of structural pluralism, our second point calls attention to the overwhelming reality of this form of social organization in America, to the extreme unlikelihood that its essential outlines will be changed in the foreseeable future, and to the need for demonstrating to the public consciousness that structural and cultural pluralism in moderate degree are not incompatible with American democratic ideals. The evidence we have examined indicates that, apart from the subsociety of the intellectuals, intimate primary group relations between members of different racial and religious groups in the United States remain at a minimal level. This structural separation provides for the preservation of the communal nature of the ethnic group, and, in the case of the major religious denominations, makes for the retention of a core of differentiated religious beliefs, values, and historical symbols important to the loyal members of the faith. To this extent, one is entitled to say that structural pluralism in America is accompanied by a moderate degree of cultural pluralism as well. There is certainly nothing in the democratic value-complex shared by most Americans and anchored in the country's historical traditions which dictates that these differentiated historico-religious values and their cultural concomitants should perforce be merged into one over-all

religious system, or that Catholics and Jews should abandon their religion and convert to Protestantism. Nor does the American democratic value-creed imply that the citizens of this land do not have the right to choose their intimate friends and (240) their organizational affiliations on the basis of whatever criteria of likeness and congeniality they find it convenient and desirable to utilize. To put it another way, subsocietal affiliation and participation in America, so far as the state is concerned, are voluntary matters (notwithstanding the fact that informal social pressures ascribe such affiliation on the basis of birth—that is, on the basis of the parents' affiliation), and the voluntary selection of structural and subsocietal affiliations, within fuctional limits, is well within the area of personal choice provided for by democratic values.

This position, of course, in no way justifies the use of racial or religious criteria in employment, housing, education, access to public facilities, or any other area in which functional benefits crucial to the fulfillment of human personality and the general welfare are concerned. In other words, it does not justify *discrimination*. But it does reserve the matter of choice in intimate primary group relationships for personal decision on whatever grounds the individual may elect to use. By the same token, it enjoins the state or any private citizen or group of citizens from interfering with those individuals who wish to form primary group relationships *across* racial or religious lines. There is no justification, for instance, in the value system of either political democracy or the Hebraic-Christian religious tradition for state or municipal laws forbidding social relationships between whites and Negroes (or other racial groups) up to and including the marriage relationship.

Finally, then, if a moderate degree of structural and cultural pluralism are legitimated by the American Creed, legitimation should be made salient in the public consciousness. For to legitimate and explain the system as it actually operates is to justify it and help to draw away the

animus that many Americans have toward minority groups which, in their minds, do not "assimilate" or "melt"—in other words, do not merge into the white Protestant population, give up their communal identity, and relinquish their cultural differences in crucial areas of belief and practice. As we (241) have indicated, for those who do not wish to "merge" to this extent, ample justification in the American value system exists. The legitimation of pluralism and the projection into the public consciousness of its justification and its reality on the American scene would also help to dispel the erroneous conclusion that it is only this group or that group that desires to maintain communal separation. In this respect, the Jews have frequently been singled out as a "separatist" minority; "clannish" is the adjective often applied. As our study has shown, although they do not succeed with the intellectuals, all of the major religious faiths—Jews, Catholics, and Protestants—operate functionally so as to perpetuate ethnic communality in the general population. The Protestants are least aware of the process since their majority status and historical precedence in America tend to make them unaware of the Protestant assumptions and criteria operative in many of the institutions which are labeled as "American" and "community-wide." Being the majority group, numerically, also tends to lessen objectively the possibility of the erosion of Protestant ethnic communality and cultural values through the process of intermarriage and other types of interethnic primary relationships. Thus Protestants have less to lose in encouraging ethnic mixture.

Our point, in sum, is not that interethnic primary group contacts are undesirable. Quite the contrary. It is rather that since many, perhaps most, members of the major faiths (and, among racial groups, notably the American Indians) basically desire some form of ethnic communality and subcultural preservation, both the reality of the system and its justification in the American value creed should be clearly brought home to the American population as a whole.

Pluralism and Assimilation: Guidelines for Agencies Concerned with Orienting the Immigrant to American Life: The analysis which we have made of the assimilation process, the factoring out (242) of the various subtypes of assimilation, and the discussion of the interaction of these subtypes, theoretically and empirically on the American scene, suggest a number of guidelines for those agencies and institutions concerned with the adjustment of immigrants and their descendants to American life and culture. These may be listed as follows:

1) Structural assimilation of immigrants to the United States (that is, the first generation arriving as adults), who enter the country in numbers substantial enough to make feasible a communal life of their own, is both impossible of attainment in most cases and undesirable as a goal toward which pressure on the immigrant might conceivably be exercised. While exceptional individuals will occasionally assimilate structurally into a native American subsociety—in many cases, the community of intellectuals—the great majority of newcomers to the country will need and prefer the security of a communal life made up of their fellow-immigrants from the homeland. This generalization is particularly applicable to immigrants of peasant, working-class, and lower-middle-class backgrounds, whose perspectives and orientations, on a statistical basis, will be inevitably narrow; however, it encompasses the great majority of immigrants of higher class origins, as well, who, in any case, are less likely to arrive in large numbers. Thus, efforts, however well-intentioned, to force structural assimilation on the immigrant are likely to be both futile and tension-producing. The newcomer needs the comfortable sociological and psychological milieu which the communality of his own group provides. Even those individuals who eventually will make major structural contact with native subsocieties can profitably use the communal base of their own group to make their initial adjustment and to fall back upon if their tentative interethnic primary group contacts prove unsatisfactory. Immigrant-adjustment

agencies, then, should not waste their time and energy in attempting to promote structural assimilation on a massive scale but should accept the functional (243) desirability of immigrant communal life with good grace. In this area, they might well limit their efforts to making significant opportunities for primary group contacts with native Americans available as alternatives on a thoroughly voluntary basis for that relatively small minority of immigrants who wish to and can meaningfully make use of such opportunities for broadening their communal life.

2) The major efforts of immigrant-adjustment agencies, then, should be directed toward acculturation, or cultural assimilation, and even here in modest degree and in selected areas. The basic goal should be the adjustment of the immigrant to American culture and institutions in those areas of secondary group and institutional contact which permit him to obtain and keep a job commensurate with his potential and training, to receive appropriate retraining and education where necessary, to perform adequately his role as a potential future citizen of both the nation and the local community, and to raise his children in ways which will neither do emotional violence to the traditions of the homeland nor subvert the family socialization process congenial to child-rearing in a basically middle-class American culture. This places the emphasis on the provision of instrumental skills: adequate use of the English language not at the expense of (nor denigration of) but in addition to the native tongue, occupational training, orientation to standard technological devices, knowledge of how to make use of the vast array of American educational opportunities, sophistication in citizenship adjustment, voting behavior, and participation in the political process generally. The functional goal would be the successful relationship of the immigrant, both culturally and structurally, to the secondary groups and instrumental institutional areas of American life. Changing the direction or nature of his intimate, primary group communal life would be excluded as a feasible or desirable product of directed effort.

3) The institutional and subcultural life of the immigrant community (244) should be regarded not only as a necessary concession to the sociological and psychological health of the new American but as providing a positive and effective means of enabling such a degree of acculturation as is posited as desirable and feasible in the paragraph above. The forms and devices of the immigrant community face two ways. On the one hand, providing the indispensable comfortable milieu, they continue the newcomer's orientation to the culture of the old country and the old locality, to its familiar ways of doing things, to its current history and its current gossip. On the other hand, they gradually incorporate elements of the American culture, interpret that culture to the newcomer in ways which he can understand, and sift its elements and bring them to his attention in a degree and at a pace which muffles and makes bearable the shock of cultural collision. The immigrant's burial and insurance societies, his indigenous church, his "foreign language" press, his favorite cafés and coffee houses, his old-style theatrical entertainments, his network of social cliques and "nationality" organizations, his ceremonies and folk dances, are never created or recreated simply as replicas of old country elements; they always progressively reflect the influence of American conditions and American events, serving as a sturdy bridge between the old and the new. In a word, the immigrant subsociety mediates between the native culture of the immigrant and the American culture. The recognition of this fact is the indispensable prerequisite for effective use of the communication channels and influence networks of the immigrant's communal life to aid and encourage the achievement of worth-while acculturation goals.

4) The American-born children of immigrants, the second generation, with exceptions based on the existence of a few rigidly enclosed enclaves, should be realistically viewed as a generation irreversibly on its way to virtually complete acculturation (although not necessarily structural assimilation) to native American cultural values at selected class levels. Exposed to the overwhelming accul-

turative (245) powers of the public school and the mass communications media, the immigrants' children will proffer their unhesitating allegiance to those aspects of the American cultural system which are visible to them in their particular portion of the socio-economic structure. The feasible and necessary task of the immigrant-adjustment agencies, in this area, is to aid in making this acculturative transition as smooth as possible, in view of the many potential difficulties, for both the children and their parents.

The tendency will be for native-born children to become alienated from their immigrant parents and the culture they represent, as they respond affirmatively to the higher status American cultural values. The challenge for social welfare agencies and institutions in the immigration field is, without mounting a doomed effort to stem the inevitable tide of American acculturation, to aid the second-generation child to gain a realistic degree of positive regard for the cultural values of his ethnic background, which will hardly retard the acculturation process, but which will give the child a healthier psychological base for his confrontation with American culture and for his sense of identification with and response to his parents. Such an effort should not preclude, of course, the encouragement of the development of effective English language skills, since this development is indispensable to adequate adjustment to American life. Nor do these counsels obviate the need to deal with the interconnected problems that the second-generation child traditionally faces as a member of a minority group, subject to some degree of prejudice and discrimination, and as a person being socialized in the lower and underprivileged sector of the socio-economic environment.

Desegration, Integration, and the Role of Government: Our sociological focus on the phenomenon of ethnic communality in the United States suggests certain important implications for the current controversies surrounding the attempts to eliminate racial (246) discrimination by law—a series of events launched into full motion by the Supreme Court school desegregation decision of 1954.

The basic theoretical distinction which it is necessary to make in the types of processes involved in these turbulent happenings has been well delineated by Kenneth Clark, who points to the differences between *desegregation* and *integration*.[5] Desegregation refers to the elimination of racial criteria in the operation of public or quasi-public facilities, services, and institutions, which the individual is entitled to as a functioning citizen of the local or national community, equal in legal status to all other citizens. It is the achievement in full of what is usually referred to as his "civil rights." Integration, however, embraces the idea of the removal of prejudice as well as civic discrimination and therefore refers to much more. In Clark's words, "Integration, as a subjective and individual process, involves attitudinal changes and the removal of fears, hatreds, suspicions, stereotypes, and superstitions. Integration involves problems of personal choice, personal readiness, and personal stability. Its achievement necessarily requires a longer period of time. It cannot come about 'overnight.' It requires education and deals poignantly with the problems of changing men's hearts and minds."[6] To which we would add that, in social structural terms, integration presupposes the elimination of hard and fast barriers in the primary group relations and communal life of the various ethnic groups of the nation. It involves easy and fluid mixture of people of diverse racial, religious, and nationality backgrounds in social cliques, families (i.e., intermarriage), private organizations, and intimate friendships. From this basic distinction between desegregation and integration, and the relation of this distinction to both sociological realities and the American democratic value system, a number of conclusions follow:

1) Desegregation—the process of eliminating racial discrimination (247) in the operation of public and quasi-

---

[5] Kenneth B. Clark, "Desegregation: The Role of the Social Sciences," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (October 1960), pp. 16-17.

[6] Ibid., p. 16.

public institutional facilities—will not lead *immediately* or, in the intermediate future, *necessarily* to integration in the sense of the dissolution of ethnic communality and the formation of large-scale primary group relationships across racial and religious lines. The tendency toward ethnic communality, as we have demonstrated, is a powerful force in American life and is supported, once the ethnic subsociety is formed, by the principles of psychological inertia, comfortable social immersion, and vested interests. Even if all southern public schools and other public facilities were to be immediately desegregated, there is no reason to suppose that the Negro and the white subcommunities would merge into one another or that the traditional barriers to intimate friendships and relationships between Negroes and white would at once come tumbling down. Certainly there is no basis for the belief that Negroes and whites, respectively encapsulated in their own subcommunity and subculture, would rush to marry each other. This sociological insight, it will be noted, is offered here in a spirit of scientific neutrality and not as a conclusion which is either good or bad from the point of view of some particular value system. I have already pointed out that, on the basis of traditional American democratic values, Negroes and whites should have the right to make close friendships and to marry across racial lines at their pleasure. But sociological realities do not indicate that these phenomena would be likely to take place in significant volume in the immediate future, even if all public and institutional discrimination were to be eliminated. If die-hard segregationists who now bitterly oppose the granting of full civic equality to Negroes could be made to understand this fact, it is possible that the debate over desegregation could be carried out in a less emotional and a more rational climate of discussion and action. It is necessary to repeat that this point is not a concession to any *right* of segregationists to bar interracial primary group relationships; it is a statement of sociological probabilities which, if correctly understood, might clear the way for more rapid and effective (248) action in such areas as public education, public transportation, public

recreation, jobs, housing, and the operation of ordinary institutional facilities which belong to all Americans on an equal basis.

2) The proper role of government in racial and ethnic matters, under the American democratic system, can be defined in three steps:

a) It is the responsibility of the government to effect desegregation—that is, to eliminate racial criteria—in the operation of all of its facilities and services at all levels, national, state, and local. The American democratic value system and the specific constitutional expression of these values in the Fifth Amendment and the three Civil War Amendments to the Federal Constitution, particularly the Fourteenth, with its clause enjoining the state from depriving any person of the "equal protection of the laws," provide the legal mandate for such a ban, and the execution of this mandate demands action (some of which, it should be noted, has already been taken) in the form of legislation, court orders, or executive orders, in such areas as jobs, housing, voting, education, service in the armed forces, and access to public facilities. Since the national government, through grants, loans, and purchasing, now has a hand in so many types of activities which were once exclusively private or, if public, purely within the scope of states and municipalities, the way is opened for entirely legitimate pressure to be exerted by the national government on recalcitrant or hesitant local governments, businesses, institutions, and individuals who still want to preserve the old segregated pattern but are reluctant to dispense with federal largesse. There will inevitably be some areas of activity where the question of whether there actually is governmental participation of sufficient scope to warrant a judgment that "state action" applies will be unclear;[7] these matters can only be decided (249) by

---

[7] For a discussion of one interesting case where the definition of "state action" was crucial and controversial, see Milton M. Gordon, "The Girard College Case: Resolution and Social Significance," *Social Problems,* Vol. 7, No. 1 (Summer, 1959), pp. 15-27.

subsequent judicial decision. Nevertheless, the major goal of getting the government—the focal expression of the will and welfare of all the people of the country—out of the business of supporting racial discrimination, either directly or indirectly, remains both clear and irreproachable.

b) It is neither the responsibility nor the prerogative of the government to attempt to impose integration, as here defined—that is, to take official notice of personal attitudes and preferences (beyond the ordinary teaching process in the public schools where standard facts and interpretations underlie the curriculum), and to interfere in any way with those personal choices in primary group relationships and organizational affiliations which make either for ethnic communality or interethnic mixture, as the case may be. I except here specific incitations to violence and, of course, paramilitary operations which threaten law and order. In short, the ordinary processes of communality, whether intra-ethnic or interethnic are beyond the scope of governmental interference or concern.

c) It is neither the responsibility nor the prerogative of the government to use racial criteria positively in order to impose desegregation upon public facilities in an institutional area where such segregation is not a function of racial discrimination directly but results from discrimination operating in another institutional area, or from other causes. If institutional area A is *de facto* segregated not because of the direct use of racial criteria but because institutional area B is segregated and because there is a relationship between institutional areas A and B, then the place to fight discrimination is not A but B. The obvious case in point is the operation of the public school system. The attempt by well-meaning "race liberals" in a number of northern communities to desegregate public schools by overturning the principle of neighborhood (250) assignment—that is, to positively promote Negro-white intermixture by means of racial assignment across neighborhood lines—is, in my opinion, misguided. It is misguided because it does exactly what is in principle wrong, regardless of how laudable the goal. It puts the government in

the business of using race as a criterion for operating one of its facilities. This is precisely what the government should not be doing, either negatively or positively. The genius of the American political tradition, in its best sense, in relation to race is that it dictates that racial criteria are *not* legitimate in the operation of governmental facilities and should be rigorously eschewed. To bring racial criteria in by the front door, so to speak, even before throwing them out the back, represents, in my opinion, no real gain for the body politic and has potentially dangerous implications for the future. If racial criteria are legitimate criteria for government consideration (which I firmly argue they are not), then the way is left open for many ominous disputes as to the merits of any particular racial clause in governmental operations.

It should be understood that I am making no specific plea here for the particular merits of the principle of neighborhood assignment to public schools. This is a matter which the educationists can debate among themselves. Furthermore, where inferior facilities in a school in a predominantly Negro area exist, or Negroes or members of any ethnic group are not appointed to teaching positions on the basis of individual qualifications, then we are in the presence of legitimate cases of racial discrimination which call for effective remedy.[8] My basic point, however, is that if *de facto* segregation of public schools in many northern cities exists because of segregation in housing (which, of course, it does), the place to fight the battle of civil rights is housing, not the public **(251)** school system, and the way to fight it is to eliminate racial criteria from the routes of access to housing space, not to inject them into the operation of the educational system.

d) It is unwise and unjustifiable for the government to create programs labeled and reserved for the benefit of

---

[8] Another qualification is necessary here. If school districts were gerrymandered originally for the sake of instituting all or predominantly Negro schools, then this initial act of discrimination should be fought and redress should be demanded.

any special racial group, or to set up racial quotas in any area of activity such as employment, as is currently demanded by some civil rights proponents. It is undeniable that the burden of unemployment bears most heavily at present on Negroes, as a result of the cumulation of past discriminatory events. However, there are white, Indian, and Oriental unemployed workers who need aid, also, and any government program designed to retrain or upgrade the job skills of occupationally disadvantaged Americans should include them as well. In other words, it should be set up as an all-inclusive "functional" rather than an exclusive racial program. It goes without saying that job hiring and promotion at all levels should be made on the basis of individual merit, not racial quotas, however "benignly" the latter may be motivated. Present wrongs do not solve the problems created by past injustices and only assure that the underlying social evil will further plague the future. We do not want "see-saw discrimination" in American life; we want the dismantling of the discriminatory apparatus.

In sum, the proper role of government is to deal equitably with all persons under its jurisdiction without taking into consideration their racial background for any purpose.

Desegregation, Integration, and Private Institutions: The distinction between the processes of desegregation and integration is not nearly so vital for assessing the role of private institutions and organizations in racial and ethnic matters. For one thing, in many types of private social institutions—for instance, fraternities and social clubs—desegregation automatically implies integration because of the kind of social relationship implicit in the operation of (252) the institution. In other private institutions of larger scope, as, for instance, the private university, college, or academy, desegregation may or may not lead to integration depending upon particular factors associated with the life of the institution such as size and the presence or absence of segregated or self-segregated subgroups.

Moreover, the arguments surrounding the choices of segregation, self-segregation, or desegregation are more varied, more complex, and more conflicting than in the case of government. However, several insights and guidelines to action are suggested by the direction and scope of our previous analysis:

1) Some types of private organizations are those for whose goals and operation ethnic background is functional and centrally relevant. Quite obviously, a Methodist mission society, a Catholic sodality, a Jewish Temple sisterhood, or a club instituted to insure social welfare benefits for Polish immigrants and their descendants cannot reasonably be expected to throw open its membership to persons of other faiths or nationalities, as the case may be. Here one can confidently assert that there is no discrimination but simply a functionally relevant definition of membership.

2) Private organizations and institutions which serve a more general purpose, while they may be, under some circumstances, technically free to restrict membership on an ethnic basis, must face a series of crucial queries. Do they receive any assistance from the public treasury either in the form of grants or exemption from the payment of taxes? Can they justify an exclusionary policy on the basis of major functional relevance to the goals of the organization? Do they claim to operate under the general principles of American democracy, Hebraic-Christian brotherhood, and fair play? Do they perform a quasi-public function such as providing general education? If, in many cases, the answers to these questions should suggest the inappropriateness of an exclusionary policy, then the way is certainly left open for efforts to institute a policy which is nondiscriminatory. If such efforts by concerned members make the (253) segregationists in the organization unhappy, it must be pointed out that initiating change in the policy of a voluntary organization at the will of a majority of its members is a thoroughly democratic procedure. Thus the ethnic practices of private organization can frequently be settled by the dy-

namics of policy-making in a democratic setting where traditional procedures are subject to current examination in a changing society.

The Built-in Tension Between the Goals of Ethnic Communality and Desegregation: Earlier in this chapter we stated that desegregation in public and quasi-public facilities was unlikely to lead to the rapid breakdown of barriers between the primary group communal life of the various ethnic groups in America, and that the fears in this area of the segregationists, however unworthy, were thus unfounded. Here we examine a point which may appear at first to repudiate the above conclusion, but which, in fact, does not, but only qualifies it.

Desegregation—or, put positively, the achievement in full of civil rights for all groups—creates situations on the job, in the neighborhood, in the school, and in the civic arena, which place persons of different ethnic background into secondary, frequently equal-status, contacts with each other. These secondary contacts will not necessarily lead to primary group relationships, such as clique friendships, common membership in small organizations, dating, and intermarriage, and in the immediate or intermediate future will probably not seriously disturb the basic outlines of ethnic communality which have been shown to exist in America. However, over a sufficiently extended period of time, these new secondary group relationships between people of diverse ethnic backgrounds will presumably lead to an increase in warm, personal friendships across ethnic lines, a broadening of cultural perspective, an appreciation of diverse values, and in some degree a rise in the rate of interethnic marriage. All of these last-named developments run counter to the sociological requirements, (254) whether realized or admitted, of ethnic closure and ethnic communality. Here, then, is another major area of social reality where the advocates of cultural pluralism (and, by implication, structural pluralism) cannot eat their cake and have it, too. There are built-in tensions between the simultaneously desired goals of

ethnic communality and full civic equality, and these tensions create for the cultural pluralists a poignant dilemma. The dilemma is particularly acute for the two large minority religious groups—the Jews and the Catholics—who do not wish to see their young people "lost" to the numerically and culturally dominant Protestant subsociety or to the community of intellectuals and yet who ardently support the fight to secure full civic equality for all persons in American society. The racial groups approach the problem somewhat differently: the Negroes, apart from the new crop of "black nationalists," have never been ideologically committed to racial communality, however much they have been forced to create it; however, those whites who desire the full complement of civil rights for all, but who are reluctant to support the idea of racial intermarriage, must wrestle with the possibility that the rate of racial intermarriage will eventually increase under conditions of full equality. The nationality groups which still hope for subcultural survival are fighting such a rear-guard and eventually futile action that the dilemma for them has less realistic overtones.

There is, I believe, no clear course of action which neatly resolves this dilemma to the complete satisfaction of all parties concerned. My point, in this section, has simply been to make the conflicting considerations apparent. It is a dilemma which is certainly close to the center of the social problems attendant upon the presence of groups of diverse cultural origins and background in a modern industrial society. I shall leave my own "solution" of it for the concluding remarks of my analysis.

The Intellectual Subsociety and Its Significance: The existence of an intellectual subsociety in America which draws upon appropriate (255) individuals from all ethnic groups for its membership and, to some degree, allows them an institutional setting for primary group relationships, has several discernible consequences—or, to put it otherwise, serves several functions, both positive and negative.

First, it serves as an institutional safety-valve for those individuals who, because of a wide-ranging interest in ideas, the arts, and people, find ethnic communality personally uncongenial. If these individuals intermarry across ethnic lines, they find the need for the intellectual subsociety sociologically pressing, since this subsociety is the only real "neutral ground" in American life and the only communal group which looks either with favor or unconcern at interethnic marriage. (This is, of course, a matter of degree; interracial marriages, especially Negro-white, are still problematic even for the intellectual subsociety.) Even those who do not intermarry find the interethnic or nonethnic social environment with its emphasis on ideas and common interests rather than on ethnic background a comfortable and necessary one. Perhaps one should say that ethnic background is not ignored in the intellectual subsociety, as witness the great interest in this milieu in ethnic folk dancing and folk singing; it is rather that ethnicity becomes an interesting but subsidiary issue rather than one which colors and dominates the rest of life. Were such a social environment and subsociety not available, individuals of the aforementioned interests and inclinations would be rebellious and unhappy as they chafed at the restrictive bonds of ethnic communality.

Second, the intellectual subsociety with its ethnic intermixture serves the rest of the nation as a symbol of the possibility of interethnic harmony and integration at the meaningful primary group level of communal living. It is true that the process of achieving such integration is still incomplete even among intellectuals; the Negro, most notably, is still only partly and imperfectly encompassed in the communal life of the intellectual group. Nevertheless, partial as ethnic integration may be within it, the intellectual subsociety still serves as the most salient example of the possibility of (256) a truly integrated society. As such, it provides a testing ground for the problems and processes inherent in the achievement of such a society and stands as a symbol of its potential development in larger scope.

A third functional consequence must be stated in negative terms, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that a question must be raised the probable answer to which has negative implications. The question is this: What are the consequences for the several major ethnic subsocieties in America of the fact that many, perhaps a large majority, of the most intellectually inclined of their birthright members are siphoned off, as it were, into a subsociety of their own, retaining only a minimal concern, if any, for the communal life and issues of their parental group? Put more specifically, if intellectuals of Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant background become alienated from the subsocietal life and concerns of their respective groups, what functional consequences result for these ethnic groups and for the general quality of American life of which these groups make up the overwhelming part? Some intellectuals, to be sure, remain within their ethnic origins groups as clergymen, communal leaders, or ordinary laymen, but the general trend is as otherwise described. Does this outflow of intellectuals from the religio-ethnic groups of America, their subsequent estrangement from the life of these groups, and the resultant block in communication between the ethnic subsociety and the intellectual have dysfunctional consequences? Do the major decisions both in the society as a whole and within the ethnic subsociety come to be made with the intellectual excluded from the decision-making process? Is there a mediocrity and stereotypy in American popular culture and in the subcultural life of each major ethnic group which results from this withdrawal of the intellectuals into a social world of their own? Do the intellectuals themselves lose out in breadth and vision as a result of this estrangement? And is this estrangement or alienation inevitable—in the very nature of things, given the scope and nature of individual genetic differences—or is it subject to elimination or modification as (257) a result of measures not yet thought of or implemented? These are questions, the answers to which, in the absence of relevant research and exploration, are not entirely clear. Nevertheless, they point to a series of problematic areas in

American life resulting from the alienation of the intellectual from popular society and culture.

The Ethnic Subsociety and Its Internal Responsibilities: The ethnic subsociety can be counted on to marshal its institutional resources to carry out the fight against racial and religious discrimination and prejudice on the American scene. Various aspects of the strategy of this indispensable effort have been discussed in previous pages. We turn now to a related but ostensibly different question: What should be the attitude of the leaders and leading organizations of the ethnic subsociety toward the subsociety itself—to the constituency which it serves—with regard to its relationship to the larger community? This topic will be considered by reference to two subquestions.

The first deals with the appropriate attitude of the institutional leadership of the ethnic subsociety toward facts and occurrences which appear to reflect unfavorably on the ethnic group. While the illustrations used below deal with the Negro group, other ethnic groups, including the white Protestant majority, could well have been utilized.

Not long ago, a journal dedicated to the cause of advancing the position of the Negro within the framework of equal rights, raised the question of whether it should devote an entire issue to the topic of delinquency and crime among Negroes. There are those who will argue that the correct answer is No—that special consideration of the above-average rates of crime and delinquency among Negroes focuses undesirable attention on this phenomenon and plays into the hands of the racists who are only too quick to point with alarm and to attribute higher Negro delinquency rates to some innate racial predisposition or inferiority.

I disagree with such a strategy. In the first place, national attention (258) has already been called to the high rates of Negro crime in the slums of the large cities through articles in such periodicals as *Time* and *Life*, and metropolitan newspapers raise the issue whenever local outbreaks of Negro "muggings" and allied violence take

place. It is therefore impossible to keep the issue from public attention even if it were considered wise to do so. More realistic and desirable goals are 1) to make the public understand the sociological rather than "racial" causes of the higher Negro rate—that is, to comprehend its source in racial discrimination and the substandard conditions, both physical and cultural, in which the great mass of Negroes are forced to live as a result of discrimination and prejudice; 2) to advance research in discovering the causes of crime and delinquency generally; 3) to research in detail the particular sociological causes for the higher Negro rate; and 4) to eliminate racial discrimination. None of these goals is advanced by an ostrich-like policy of avoiding recognition of the higher Negro crime and delinquency rate and by misguided restriction of informed and responsible discussion of the issue.

In the larger sense, it may be said that truth and understanding are the necessary preludes to informed and constructive action in the field of interethnic group relations. Donald Young stated this principle effectively over a decade ago:

> It is good technique to keep members of both races accurately informed about interracial questions. There is no better way to answer false assertions, kill tension-breeding rumors, and build a solid foundation for democratic action. This principle is generally accepted, but it is commonly misused because of fear that if the truth is not entirely laudatory of the Negro it may lead to greater prejudice. Also, because Negroes are sensitive and quick to infer insults . . . , racial liberals are reluctant to risk giving offense. The twisting or omitting of facts, exaggeration and plain prevarication in defensive arguments about race and crime, industrial skill, educational and scientific achievement, military accomplishment, literary and artistic products, etc. are commonplace. But the unvarnished truth alone contradicts racial dogma, (259) checks rumors, and in precluding specious rebuttal is more effective than the most kindly white lie. Unless

> the established facts are adhered to rigidly, and both weaknesses and strengths honestly included in interracial educational campaigns, the main results are likely to be a lack of public confidence and a weak foundation for action programs.[9]

The principle applies with equal force, of course, to Jews, Catholics, white Protestants, or any other ethnic group.

The second subquestion may be phrased as follows: Does the ethnic subsociety have any special responsibility to guide the behavior of its members with respect to avoidance of those forms of action which are patently injurious to society? Certainly if we phrase this question in terms of the attitudes of institutions in the white subsocieties toward racists, the answer appears clear enough. We expect white Protestant and Catholic churches and Jewish synagogues, for instance, to urgently preach doctrines of racial brotherhood, to support desegregation both in the church itself and in the larger society, and to actively oppose prejudice and discrimination. And we take the position that civic organizations, generally, stemming from the white subsocieties, should take a similar stand. Suppose we ask the question, however, with respect to a minority subsociety, and suppose some form of anti-social behavior may be particularly salient within its ranks as a result of the forces generated by prejudice and discrimination. Here, let us again use as an example the Negro community and the high rate of delinquency found in the Negro lower class.

Does the "Negro community" have, in fact, a special responsibility and role to play in the prevention of delinquency among Negro youth? The argument against any special responsibility, of course, runs something like this: Rates of delinquency and crime are the product of general sociological and psychological forces which are within the control and responsibility of the total community (260) and not in any special way of the Negro community. Fur-

[9] Donald Young, "Techniques of Race Relations," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (April 1947), pp. 157-8.

thermore, wherever higher rates of Negro delinquency are present, these higher rates are the result of prejudice and discrimination shown by whites and embedded in the institutions of the total community. Therefore any attribution of special responsibility to the Negro community is both morally unjustified and logically fallacious. There is much to be said for this argument, and, in a strict theoretical sense, I would agree that the Negro community should accept no attribution of responsibility for Negro delinquency which implies either a special ethical obligation to deal with it or an acceptance of the fallacious thesis that its sources are fundamentally indigenous to Negro communal life.

However, I would not be content to rest here. I would say that while the Negro community does not bear a special *responsibility* in the matter of Negro crime, it does, in terms of the sociological realities, have a special *opportunity* in practical terms to focus, voluntarily, a portion of its resources on the problem of reducing the Negro delinquency rate. The existence of specifically Negro organizations and institutions, the sense of identification with the Negro group on the part of Negro individuals, the *de facto* restriction of social participation to the Negro community —all these components of Negro communal and subcultural existence—are sociological realities. The sociological reality of the Negro subsociety thus provides special opportunities for Negro communal leaders acting through Negro communal institutions to play a special role in the reduction of rates of anti-social behavior by Negroes.

To particularize: Negro communal leaders may 1) be in a position to provide special insights into the dynamics of social processes within the Negro lower classes and Negro lower-class family life which contribute to the excessive delinquency rate; 2) be able to do more effective ameliorative field work in standard social work processes because of the greater rapport which is likely to exist between lower-class Negroes and Negro social workers, and to supplement (261) existing social work measures directed toward the Negro community which are currently

in short supply; and 3) be in a position to devise and carry through institutional counter-measures whose particular effectiveness would derive from their source within the Negro community. To ignore these opportunities, it seems to me again, is to adopt an ostrich-like policy with regard to the multiplicity of specific variables which combine to produce the higher Negro delinquency rate, and correspondingly to make possible the multiplicity of counter-measures which offer special opportunities for action by the Negro community itself. To put it succinctly, simply because the *ultimate causes* of the higher Negro delinquency rate stem from broader social forces in the general community does not signify that *some effective counter-measures* cannot be taken at existing levels of structure and process by the Negro community itself. Thus I would argue that while the Negro community does not have, in the strict philosophical sense, a special *responsibility* to concern itself with Negro delinquency, it does have, in realistic sociological terms, a special *opportunity* to devote some attention and resources to this phenomenon. In short, my point is that the ethnic subsociety, whatever its racial, religious, or nationality background, from a sociological point of view has special opportunities to deal with particular behavior problems which may be related to its social history and current situation, and these opportunities should not be bypassed, even though the more basic roots of the problem lie in the institutions and practices of the larger society.

Nothing I have said suggests, of course, in any way that the Negro community should curtail or diminish its increasingly insistent and effective efforts (aided by many white liberals) toward achieving the broader long-range goals of eliminating prejudice and discrimination from American life. In the last analysis, the attainment of equal opportunities in education, employment, housing, and access to public facilities, and the development of mutual respect for America's varied racial, religious, and national back- (262) grounds among all her citizens constitute the ultimate effective solution to problems of social disorgan-

ization which bear unequally on particular minority groups.

Pluralism, Democratic Values, and Long-Range Goals for America: Our final remarks deal with the implications of our analysis of ethnic communality and the assimilation process for long-range goals in American social life with regard to intergroup relations. Into this analysis we must interpolate, too, the significance of democratic values as we understand them.

The struggle to eliminate racial and religious prejudice and discrimination from American life—a struggle, the unequivocal rightness of which, sociologically and ideologically, this volume takes for granted—goes on against the underlying social reality of ethnic communality tenaciously maintaining itself in an industrial urbanized society. We have described the nature of this ethnic communality as, basically, structural pluralism accompanied by an ever-decreasing degree of cultural pluralism. The relationship of this kind of a society to the problems inherent in attempting to eliminate ethnic prejudice and discrimination have been discussed in the preceding pages. What, now, of the future? What are the viable goals for America with regard to ethnic communality, given the desire to eliminate or reduce prejudice and discrimination, the nature of sociological realities, and commitment to the American democratic value system?

The system of cultural pluralism (which ultimately depends on structural pluralism) has frequently been described as "cultural democracy," since it posits the right of ethnic groups in a democratic society to maintain their communal identity and their own subcultural values. We have already argued that since ethnic communality rests principally on personal choices in primary group relations and private organizational affiliations, it falls well within the scope of those areas of free choice guaranteed by democratic (263) values. Reversing the coin, however, we must also point out that democratic values prescribe free choice not only for groups but also for individuals. That

is, the individual, as he matures and reaches the age where rational decision is feasible, should be allowed to choose freely whether to remain within the boundaries of communality created by his birthright ethnic group, to branch out into multiple interethnic contacts, or even to change affiliation to that of another ethnic group should he wish to do so as a result of religious conversion, intermarriage, or simply private wish. If, to the contrary, the ethnic group places such heavy pressures on its birthright members to stay confined to ethnic communality that the individual who consciously wishes to "branch out" or "move away" feels intimidated or subject to major feelings of personal guilt and therefore remains ethnically enclosed, or moves but at considerable psychological cost, then we have, in effect, cultural democracy for groups but not for individuals. Realistically, it is probably impossible to have a socialization process for the child growing up in a particular ethnic group that does not involve some implicitly restrictive values; nevertheless, the magnitude and intensity of such restrictive norms must be kept within bounds if we are not to be left with a system which provides cultural democracy for groups but enforced ethnic enclosure for individuals.

Probably the vast majority of Americans, as revealed in their choices in primary group relations and organizational affiliations, desire ethnic communality, at least in essential outline. Their preferences are reinforced by the self-perpetuating pressures generated by the nature of subcommunity organizational life and by the demands and exhortations, grounded in ideological conviction, of their ethnic community leaders. As we have suggested, some individuals, as a result of their particular inclinations and perspectives, move out into an amorphously structured intellectual subcommunity which contains people of all ethnic backgrounds. All of these recurring processes are probably inevitable and basically irreversible. **(264)** Thus the prognosis for America for a long time to come is that its informal social structure will consist of a series of ethnic subcommunities criss-crossed by social class, within which

primary group relationships will tend to be confined, that secondary group relationships across ethnic group lines will take place in abundance as a result of the requirements of an urbanized industrial society, and that the intellectual subsociety will grow somewhat both in numbers and in institutional articulation as a result of the constant increase in the magnitude of higher education.[10]

The major problem, then, is to keep ethnic separation in communal life from being so pronounced in itself that it threatens ethnic harmony, good group relations, and the spirit of basic good will which a democratic pluralistic society requires, and to keep it from spilling over into the civic arena of secondary relations to impinge on housing, jobs, politics, education, and other areas of functional activity where universalistic criteria of judgment and assignment are necessary and where the operation of ethnic considerations can only be disruptive and even disastrous. The attainment of this objective calls for good sense and reasonableness on the part of the average American citizen, regardless of ethnic background, and in addition to these qualities, a high degree of civic statesmanship on the part of ethnic communal leaders who will be tempted at times, out of their own convictions and enthusiasms, to emphasize ethnic exclusion and the demands in time and resources from their particular constituents which are likely to make for exclusion and separation, regardless of intent.

In sum, the basic long-range goal for Americans, with regard to ethnic communality, is fluidity and moderation within the context (265) of equal civic rights for all, regardless of race, religion, or national background, and the option of democratic free choice for both groups and individuals. Ethnic communality will not disappear in the

---

[10] I do not mean to indicate that all, or even most, college graduates become "intellectuals" or interacting members of the intellectual subsociety. By no means. However, the spread of higher education opens the doors of possible entrance into the intellectual subsociety to an increasing number of those who are intellectually or temperamentally suited for it.

foreseeable future and its legitimacy and rationale should be recognized and respected. By the same token, the bonds that bind human beings together across the lines of ethnicity and the pathways on which people of diverse ethnic origin meet and mingle should be cherished and strengthened. In the last analysis, what is gravely required is a society in which one may say with equal pride and without internal disquietude at the juxtaposition: "I am a Jew, or a Catholic, or a Protestant, or a Negro, or an Indian, or an Oriental, or a Puerto Rican;" "I am an American;" and "I am a man."

DESEGREGATION CREATES PROBLEMS, TOO

by I. N. Berlin.*

Reviewed in *Saturday Review*, June 15, 1963, from "*Integration vs. Segregation*," Hubert H. Humphrey, Editor.

(230) EFFORTS to end *de facto* segregation in the schools have, in some instances, resulted in educational segregation that has serious implications for the mental health of both teachers and students.

When children of minority groups are driven by bus to schools in upper middle-class areas to reduce the *de facto* segregation found in the neighborhood schools, both teachers and students often are faced with new problems that they have not anticipated or been prepared for. The

---

*Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry, University of California School of Medicine, and for many years a consultant in child psychiatry to the public school systems in California.

efforts of citizens' groups and especially the N.A.A.C.P., in arousing the citizenry against *de facto* segregation must not end when a new method of apportioning school populations occurs. Moreover, the citizens' groups need to be aware of some of the possible adverse effects of their pressures on educators which tend to result in new kinds of segregation.

Many of my colleagues in education throughout the country have expressed concern that the fear of being accused of racial discrimination has led school people to avoid dealing with destructive, unruly, and aggressive behavior by Negro youngsters as they would with similar behavior on the part of white children.

More serious is the fear of arousing cries of racial discrimination when teachers begin to help the educationally backward Negro child to learn and expect him to do academic work he has not been asked to do in other school situations. Many Negro youngsters find themselves academically far behind other members of their class. They require a good deal of help and need to make a great effort to catch up. Since such efforts have not been expected of them in other schools, many children in these circumstances feel angry and defiant. (231) They often begin to clamor that they are being treated unfairly. Rather than risk such an uproar, in many schools administrators advise their teachers *not* to expect much from these students, in fact, to just let them sit.

Here is discrimination of another kind. Smaller classes and higher academic standards may not be the hoped-for boon for these youngsters.

Educators are well aware that children from economically deprived families often have difficulties and problems in learning because their parents' primary concerns are food and existence, not education. Many of these children have not been helped by any adults in the home to experience the pleasures that come from learning and achievement. Frequently their parents have not had a chance to experience such learning themselves. In the overcrowded classrooms of many cities, staffed by under-

paid teachers with meager equipment, it becomes miracle that some children do develop a desire to learn and do learn. But for many, school is a holding action; there is little pleasure in it. They are bored, restless, and unhappy, because their energies are not used in any constructive and meaningful way. The boredom and restlessness leads the vigorous child to unruly and boisterous behavior, and the child without much energy to withdrawn, sullen, apathetic reverie.

In this way the never-ending circle of academic uninterest, failure, and behavioral difficulties begins for many youngsters.

While all segregated schools are not overcrowded and deficient in the stimuli necessary for learning, statistically, the overwhelming majority are. Similarly, some Negro children from segregated schools have no difficulty at all in adjusting to an integrated school. These youngsters have learned to enjoy academic achievement and are good students who will benefit very quickly and very substantially from the new situation. However, most Negro youngsters from deprived families have had very traumatic experiences with learning at home and at school.

When children who have had these experiences are taken to a school in another neighborhood and placed in classes with children who have not been handicapped and are therefore far more effective in the mastery of academic material, their academic retardation makes them feel out of place, uneasy, anxious, and depressed. They yearn to learn. They want very much to become accepted in the new setting and yet they feel so hopelessly behind the other youngsters (232) that they begin, almost inevitably, to resort to the only behavior they have learned to use to cope with such distressing feelings. Such behavior makes it very difficult for the teacher, who has not been made aware of, and therefore does not understand, the meaning of this sequence, to want to work with the child.

I am concerned not only with the welfare of the child in the school and the effects of continued educational segregation, but also with the mental health of the teacher because she has thus been placed in a psychologically un-

tenable situation that has potentially serious results for her.

Most teachers get their satisfactions in an underpaid and overworked profession from helping children learn. They know that helping children to get pleasure and feelings of self-worth from mastering academic tasks and acquiring skills is a prerequisite for any successful achievement in living, and especially any success at working at demanding jobs in our highly technical society. Teachers get their feelings of self-worth and pleasure from their effective help to children.

In upper middle class areas, the parents are largely business and professional people who value learning, expect their children to achieve in school and work closely with the teachers. Such schools offer the most sought-after teaching assignments and to them come the teachers who place high value on teaching, learning and academic achievement. Ostensibly these are the very teachers who should be able to give the most help to the Negro child who needs to be helped. But because they value learning and enjoy teaching they often resent children who have little interest or desire to learn. However, they have usually learned that with persistent effort, endless patience, and parental cooperation they can help most children begin to learn and even in time to enjoy it. In most situations they therefore persist through the clamor, protests, excuses, weeping and resistance until the child finally understands that he is expected to work and to stay with each task until it has been mastered. Such mastery results eventually in beginning pleasure and finally in enjoyment of academic achievement.

If the teacher should fear that her persistence may be misconstrued by parents and others as discriminating behavior, and if she is encouraged by administrators not to create a fuss, then she may not make the necessary effort and the whole point of racial desegregation is defeated.

(233) Herein lies the dilemma. If she does not do her best job, if she does not work as effectively to teach the Negro child as well as the white child to master academic skills, she has failed in her most satisfying activity, teach-

ing. She is being neither an effective teacher nor honest and forthright with herself. Eventually such a realization on her part will affect all of her teaching. The youngsters who are not worked with effectively will of necessity be bored, feel deprived, and actually discriminated against, and therefore will become increasingly disruptive and an even greater burden to the teacher and the school.

If the teacher does her job as best she can, if she does persist and make every effort to help the reluctant Negro child to begin to work and to learn, and this does arouse the child's sensitized parents and creates an incident in the school, she may face the ire of school authorities and be considered by them a failure as a teacher.

How, then, can this dilemma be solved?

It seems to me first, that it needs to be anticipated by school authorities, teachers, parents, and civic groups. Then they must plan together how to help the child, his parents, and the educator to work out the inevitable problems.

Further, it becomes important that the teachers and administrators come to understand how these youngsters feel when they are brought into a new school situation, especially those who are at a serious academic disadvantage.

The only way many of these children have learned to master anxiety, tension, and unease is by loud, boisterous, disturbing behavior, which at least evokes a known and predictable response from authorities. With this in mind, teachers and administrators may be able to anticipate and prepare themselves and the other children to deal with tension and anxiety. Continued efforts until the children are acclimated to their new surroundings require preliminary orientation of school personnel and children. The new child needs to be told in advance that he may feel such tension and anxiety, but that everyone will try to help him until learning becomes easier for him; other, more fortunate youngsters can be enlisted to help with profit to all.

These are not problems, it should be remembered, that occur only as a result of segregation and discrimina-

tion. Many of my colleagues in education tell me that such problems are becoming increasingly prevalent in all-white schools. Here also the child's learning (234) difficulties, which stem from parental emotional difficulties and the parents' failure to learn in many areas themselves, result in clamor at the teacher's insistence that the child learn. Such clamor often angers parents, who have never themselves been able to help the child learn or insist that he follow through on any task. The anger is often a reflection of the parents' unrealistic hope that the school will do the parental job. These troubled parents are usually vocal enough to intimidate some school authorities who counsel their teachers to let the child sit. Such administrators thus compound the problem for the conscientious and idealistic teacher, the non-learning child, the troubled parent, and the entire school system.

The awareness of civic groups and educators that efforts at racial desegregation require continued vigilance, cooperation, and continued education of all concerned may make educational desegregation and equal opportunity to learn more of a reality.

EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS OF SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION

by John H. Fischer.

From "*Education in Depressed Areas.*"
A. Harry Passow, Editor.

(290) To say that the problems of race relations in the United States are complex hardly helps to clarify our situation, but, unless the complexity of this matter is seen and taken constantly into account, no single step is likely to be very useful.[1] The problems of American education are no less complex. In a nation as diversified as ours, universal education can never be simple, and it is universal education, with emphasis on both adjective and noun, that we must now achieve. As the issues of race relations permeate almost every aspect of our life, so events in our schools are interlaced with virtually everything we do or hope to do. The difficulties of operating schools which can cope successfully and, as they must, simultaneously with both racial and educational issues are therefore among the most puzzling of all the problems facing the American people.

The other side of the coin, however, is that the benefits that can flow from the solution of these two problems will be of a magnitude comparable to the difficulties themselves.

Virtually all the purposes for which our schools are maintained may be grouped under two major classifications. First, the school is expected to give every student the opportunity and the means to develop to the full whatever individual potential he may have. One purpose of the school, to say it more briefly, is to help each student make the most of himself.

The second purpose is related to the first but not entirely congruent with it. This is to induct the young per-

---

[1] Prepared for delivery at the Fourth Annual Conference of the Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D. C., May 3, 1962.

son systematically into the culture and society to which he is an heir and in which he should be a partner. The school's success in respect to this purpose must be gauged not only by the competence of its graduates but by the quality of their sense of moral responsibility.

By viewing what we do with any child, of any race, against these considerations, one personal, the other social, we should be able to reach (291) reasonably sound conclusions about the effectiveness of our schools and the extent to which their performance approaches the ideals we project in our statements of philosophy.

Limitations of time make it impossible to include in this paper more than passing reference to the fact that the educational problems of desegregation and integration have important political, legal, and social aspects. I shall concentrate upon the more purely educational dimensions of the matter, which is to say its cultural and psychological aspects.

The temptation is always strong to say that the Negro child should be seen merely as any other child, respected as an individual, and provided with an educational program that will best meet his particular combination of needs. Of course the Negro child, like every other child, is entitled to be treated as an individual. Such treatment is the only sound basis for projecting his or any other child's education, but the easy generalization does not always come to grips with the whole truth.

The American Negro youngster happens to be a member of a large and distinctive group that for a very long time has been the object of special political, legal, and social action. This, I remind you, is not a question of what should be true, or might have been, but an undeniable and inescapable fact. To act as though any child is suddenly separable from his history is indefensible. In terms of educational planning, it is also irresponsible.

Every Negro child is the victim of the history of his race in this country. On the day he enters kindergarten, he carries a burden no white child can ever know, no matter what other handicaps or disabilities he may suffer.

We are dealing here with no ordinary question of intercultural understanding, although admittedly cultural difference is a part of the difficulty. Nor are we concerned with only the usual range of psycho-educational problems, for the psychological situation of the Negro child is affected by quite special social considerations.

I recognize the hazard in speaking of "the Negro child." It is equally unsatisfactory to speak of "the white child" or "the Puerto Rican child" or "the Spanish-American child" as though any child could be encompassed in a stereotype. Whatever a child's ethnic or racial background, he may be bright or slow, attractive or unpleasant; his parents may be rich or poor, well-educated or illiterate, responsible or shiftless. Every racial group distributes itself in some fashion over the whole social and economic scale. But when all the variability is conceded, it cannot be denied that every American Negro child must expect to encounter certain problems which none of our other children face in quite the same way.

Many of the recent efforts to integrate Negro pupils into the mainstream (292) of American public education have been built on the assumption that the problems are essentially administrative, legal, or political. As a consequence, we have seen drives for what is called "open enrollment" and other schemes to bring about, usually through directive action, a desired combination of races in particular classrooms or schools. Having worked in school administration for some twenty-seven years, I claim some knowledge of at least its limitations. Although I hold that administrative procedures and actions can be useful in education, I grow steadily more certain that no major problem of education—by which I mean really effective teaching and learning—has ever been solved solely, or even primarily, by legal or administrative action. To be sure, such action often lays the necessary groundwork and provides the setting in which good teachers may carry on their work, but the critical point in any educational system is found ultimately in the relation between the teacher and the pupil.

What, then, can be done to produce the sort of pupil-teacher relationship that will contribute most to the tasks we are thinking of today?

For one thing, we must continue to recognize the element of cultural difference. As the Educational Policies Commission pointed out in a recent statement, a principal part of the difficulty of what the Commission calls the "disadvantaged American" is the fact that a substantial minority of Americans have grown up in cultures which are not compatible with much of modern life. This minority consists by no means only of Negroes, nor are all Negroes culturally disadvantaged. But vast numbers of them are, as a direct consequence of legal and social segregation.

The situation is not new. The mountain whites and rural Negroes, among others, have lived in cultural isolation for a long time. Now, however, the negative influence of poor economic conditions in their former homes combined with the positive illusory attraction of the city have caused a vast and growing migration. The congregation of tens of thousands of these people in places for which their customary living patterns are ill-adapted tragically dramatizes their cultural dislocation.

Many of the Negro children who now come to school are the victims of their parents' lack of knowledge and of schooling. The parents in turn are the victims of a situation over which they have had little or no control themselves. Parents and children alike elicit sympathy and attract charity, but praiseworthy as these responses may be, they form no adequate approach to the education of the disadvantaged urban child. The response of the community and the school must be based also on objective knowledge and mature understanding of the underlying difficulty and an inventive turn in mind among teachers and administrators. Teaching reading, for example, to a first-grade child who has never seen an adult read (293) anything requires an approach quite different from one appropriate to a child in whose home books are as normal as food.

Similarly, a child who has never known sustained conversation with his parents must actually learn the skills of continuing discussion before he can learn much else in school.

Nor is it enough to say that the school should accept the child where it finds him and raise him as high and as fast as it can toward an adequate level of cultural attainment. To be sure, this is one of the school's functions; no teacher ever succeeds unless he first establishes rapport and communication with the pupil at the pupil's level. But the school's procedures and its success will necessarily differ between the child whose home background daily complements what the school does, and the one who is caught, so to speak, in a cultural downdraft the moment he steps outside the school.

In dealing with a population which is racially and culturally integrated, the school must begin by encouraging teachers to understand the special factors in the backgrounds of all their children, to take these differences imaginatively into account, and to build curricula and teaching techniques that reflect not only idealism but realism as well.

In addition to the cultural aspect, intellectual considerations are involved in meeting the problems of racial integration. A good school is responsibly concerned with all of the aspects of a child's development, but the central purpose that must run through all sound education is the development of intellectual strength. Unless the school is able to help every child to use his mind effectively, none of the other purposes of education can be satisfactorily achieved. We customarily cite physical health as a fundamental goal of education, but unless the child learns to apply his own intelligence to the problem of remaining healthy, he is not likely to do much either for his own well-being or for the public health of his community. The young person who does not become critically thoughtful about moral values, who behaves well only when someone is watching him or forcing him to conform, cannot be trusted to manage his own morality. But the school's success in pursuing this central purpose of education is sub-

ject, like so many of its other efforts, to what happens to the pupil outside the school.

In respect to the development of intellectual competence, many Negro children face special problems that should be better understood than they often are. Obviously many Americans of Negro ancestry have attained distinction in fields requiring intellectual eminence and millions of others daily apply their minds with excellent results in more humble ways. Yet the fact remains that during years of oppression, first under slavery and later under more subtle forms of discrimination, the opportunities for (294) large numbers of Negroes to apply their own rational powers with initiative and freedom to important problems have been far more limited than the opportunities available to other racial groups. Many Negro children, therefore, carry the disabling scars of the culture in which they were nutured, a culture which encouraged the use of muscles and not only discouraged but often penalized those who sought to use their minds creatively. The school must take all of this into account and build programs and provide opportunities which not only reflect these facts but move aggressively to compensate for them.

Every educational problem has its emotional side, and the special problems of educating Negro children in desegregated schools have theirs. Not being a psychologist, I do not intend to examine this complex question at any length. But there can be little doubt that the education of many Negro children is adversely affected by emotional considerations. The fact that it is often difficult to distinguish among the cultural, the intellectual, and the emotional aspects of education is one reason why teaching any child is so complex.

One of the most serious of the details is the problem of motivation. The Horatio Alger story is a well established part of our folklore, but few Americans would argue that the typical Alger hero would have made it had his skin been of a darker shade. The sense of frustration which any minority child may experience is heightened in the case of the Negro child, who discovers all too early that his mi-

nority has both a special history in the United States and quite unique problems. As a consequence, his attitude toward himself and toward his racial group complicates the effort to help him secure an adequate education. In some cases, he may rationalize his failures by attributing them to limitations which do not, in fact, exist for him. In others, he may develop an understandable aggressiveness which will neither compensate for external difficulties nor correct his own shortcomings. The wise and well-informed teacher is aware of these emotional complications and undertakes to deal with them in positive ways.

In the face of these facts, and in the light of our democratic values, what guidelines for policy and practice in the conduct of American public schools are implied?

In the first place, it is essential to emphasize on every possible occasion and in everything we do in schools that the rights of students, the assessments of their needs, and the release of their potentials must be approached on an individual basis. What I have said about the identification of students as members of groups is important only insofar as it helps the teacher to understand a particular student. My point, you may remember, is that the individual cannot be understood unless he is seen against the (295) history from which he has come and in terms of the situation in which he currently lives. But his education is peculiarly his own. The opportunities afforded any child may not properly be limited because he happens to be a member of one or another racial group. In this connection, again, we face the hazard of stereotyped treatment, a hazard which at all costs must be avoided.

This implication for policy and practice cuts more than one way, however, for just as certainly as no person should be subjected to discriminatory treatment which depresses him because of his race, so it follows that none should be given preferential treatment simply because his complexion or his ancestry is different from another's. A practical application of this principle may arise if a school organizes classes according to the academic ability of students. If, after the most reliable estimates of ability the school can make, it should develop that one classroom

contains pupils largely of one racial group while a second classroom is composed mostly of another, the school should not be criticized for the result. If, on the other hand, the school authorities have used an ostensibly educational device simply to justify some predetermined racial arrangement, the action is totally indefensible. It should be attacked not only as a violation of the constitutional rights of children but as a flagrant instance of professional malpractice.

A second guideline for the development of policy and practice centers about the concept of equality of opportunity. "Equality of opportunity," as we customarily use the phrase, means much more than a schoolroom desk for every child. It connotes, rather, a condition in which every American may rightfully expect to find himself in fair competition with every other American. This condition is achieved and maintained by the operation of a host of agencies and forces, some political, some social, others economic or cultural. The public school has never been the only agency concerned with producing equality of opportunity, but its role is fundamental to the total effort.

In the cases of some Americans, and in that of the Negro American most dramatically, our traditional system has failed for a long time and in countless ways to provide that equality of opportunity that should be the condition of all our people. Recent improvements have helped correct the imbalance, but much more correction is required. Especially is this true of children whose parents and grandparents were deliberately, systematically, and by law denied what is now clearly recognized as fully equal treatment.

Is it not a reasonable contention—and a just one—that to compensate for past injustice, we should offer these children educational services beyond the level of what might be called standard equality?

(296) Could it be that to achieve total equality of opportunity in America we may have to modify currently accepted ideas about equality of opportunity in education itself? Is it conceivable that some of our children are entitled to more and better educational opportunities than

most of the others? In fact, of course, the question has already been answered. Thousands of mentally and physically handicapped children, regardless of race, regularly receive teaching service, physical facilities, and supporting services more extensive and more costly than those furnished children who are considered physically or mentally normal. In the cases of many Negro children —and the generalization would apply also to certain other minority groups—we may need to substitute for our traditional concept of equal educational opportunity a new concept of compensatory opportunity.

Such compensatory opportunity might take the form of lower student-teacher ratios in certain schools, or additional guidance services, or better physical facilities. The idea might mean more scholarships for higher education, or, in some cases, custodial and boarding care for children whose welfare required their removal from a crippling environment.

I doubt that anyone is in a position now to say precisely what the concept of compensatory educational opportunity would mean in every case, but my purpose here is not so much to answer the question as to raise it for discussion. The concept of compensatory opportunity should certainly not be restricted to any one group, and, as I have suggested, it has already been applied to other types of disability. But, to the degree that a child's race or cultural background handicaps him—and especially where the handicap is attributable, at least in part, to earlier governmental action—they should be taken into account in adjusting his educational program.

A third guide to educational policy and practice seems relevant to this discussion. If we are to keep the focus of our educational effort on the welfare of the individual child, we shall do well to avoid what is sometimes called social engineering. The very term is inconsistent with the purposes and values of democracy. Even the most desirable end does not justify manipulating people to create a structure pleasing to some master planner. To put it precisely, I am disturbed about the growing pressure to

locate schools, draw district lines, and organize curricula in order to achieve a pre-determined racial pattern of enrollment. By no means am I opposing the desirability of having in the same school children of different racial backgrounds. Quite the contrary! But decisions about school organization based entirely or primarily on racial criteria seem to me to violate the principle of non-discrimination. All school districting arrangements should provide a maximum of free choice for all children, subject only to common sense protection against unnecessary overcrowding. Indeed, if (297) I had my way, I should have no school attendance districts at all. In a well conducted school system every school should be so good that those who live near it would never think of going elsewhere except for some extraordinary reason. In the case of secondary schools, or others where specialized curricula might be a factor, the importance of the neighborhood location would, of course, be somewhat less significant. But here again the greatest possible freedom of choice should be allowed all pupils, so long as they are qualified for the programs involved.

The concept of freedom of choice should be interpreted, however, only to allow positive choice and never to permit any group to restrict the opportunities of another. The basic principle is that all public schools of a community belong to all the people of the community, that none is the exclusive preserve of a single racial group.

The most offensive aspect of the engineered approach is the assumption that any group can be improved if members of another race are introduced into it. If all the races of mankind are equally to be valued and respected, a group composed of thirty members of Race A cannot be improved merely by substituting a few members of Race B. If, on the other hand, the group is to be improved with regard, let us say, to mathematical performance, the introduction of a couple of mathematical wizards will obviously raise the average. A musical group short of tenors can surely be improved by recruiting three good tenors, but the point of origin of their grandfathers or the color

of their hair are scarcely relevant criteria. We cannot have it both ways: we cannot say that race *per se* makes no difference and then argue that important decisions should be based on this inconsequential factor.

To summarize then, briefly what I have tried to say about the educational problems of desegregating schools:

1. The focus of sound teaching is always on the individual, for education is an intensely personal matter, having its principal effect always within the person.

2. If we are to achieve good education, we must respect the individuality of each student, relating his instruction to his background, his needs, his possibilities.

3. To achieve equality of opportunity within the whole of our culture, it may be necessary to offer those who are handicapped by their history or their current situation not merely equal, but compensatory educational opportunity.

4. In the organization of education, many considerations are important, many characteristics are relevant, but racial differences in themselves are not. In the administration of schools, therefore, the manipulation of pupils on purely racial grounds is irrelevant and improper.

THE GOALS OF INTEGRATION

by Oscar Handlin.*

(From *Daedalus*—Winter 1966)

(268) SINCE 1954, and even more so since 1960, Americans concerned with resolving the dilemma posed by the Negro's plight in a society committed to equal rights have lived in a state of crisis. The destruction of the concept of "separate but equal" in the Brown Case was the culmination of a quarter-century of re-examination of the premise that the colored men of the United States could be held permanently in a position that was actually separate but unequal. The implications of that decision were not immediately clear; nor have they been clarified in the intervening eleven years.[1]

Had the decision been immediately acceded to, it might have been possible to begin at once to explore its consequences. Instead, the necessity for fighting a succession of guerrilla actions behind the lines has delayed any consideration of long-range problems. Attention has been so narrowly focused on tactical issues that there has been no time to consider ultimate goals. The civil rights movement, which is actually a congeries of quite disparate efforts, maintains the pretense of unity only by a resolute determination not to think of long-term objectives.

However, we know all too well, from an earlier conflict a century ago, that battles and even wars can be won

---

* A.B. Brooklyn College, M.A., Ph.D. Harvard. Dr. Handlin has served Harvard as instructor, assistant professor, and full professor of history. In 1954 he became Director of the Center for the Study of Liberty in America. In 1945 he received the Pulitzer Prize for history. Other honors include: Guggenheim Fellow, 1954; Christopher Award, 1958; and the Brooklyn College Alumni Award. Dr. Handlin has authored many books including: *Boston's Immigrants, Commonwealth, This Was America, The American People in the Twentieth Century, Adventure in Freedom, Chance of Destiny, Race and Nationality in American Life, Immigration as a Factor in American History, The Newcomers, Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis, American Principles and Issues, the Dimensions of Liberty.*

and yet the fruits of victory lost through men's haziness about what they are fighting for. In the present situation, the inability to define the ultimate goals of the civil rights struggle is an unacknowledged threat that complicates immediate tactics and that may deprive this momentous upheaval of its meaning.

In the absence of defined goals, it is difficult to estimate the character or pace of change or even to judge its direction. Under these circumstances, organizational controls and leadership weaken. There is confusion about which objectives are salient, and issues tend to crop up of their own accord. Action is sporadic, local, and (269) discontinuous and is not related to any general standard of importance. Explosive activists, always ready to precipitate conflict, find tactical opportunities to determine the questions to be fought over while the established leadership has to tag along to maintain its influence. At the same time, the atmosphere of continuous crisis generates the obligation of solidarity. Those who dissent must be silent or be counted as sympathizers of the antagonists. No one wishes to be known as an Uncle Tom or a white liberal.[2]

Recent demonstrations of solidarity on behalf of civil rights have been impressive. The march on Washington in 1963 and from Selma in 1965 showed the extent to which diverse elements in American society coalesced in support of a common cause. These occasions have ceremonial significance; they manifest the extent to which a variety of people affirm their dislike of brutality and their faith in the orderly methods of democracy. There is no difficulty in eliciting unanimity of support for the slogan of equal rights as man and citizen as long as the terms remain vague and undefined.

But it is erroneous to regard these events or professions of sentiment as expressions of unity with reference to a program of action. The calls for brotherly love sounded on the platforms do not reduce the intensity of the hatreds in Harlem. White resentment at black demands is also stiffening. It is a mistake to judge the extent

of backlash by the refusal to commit suicide in 1964; the California vote on Proposition Fourteen that year was more revealing than the national vote against Goldwater. Popular sentiment is still for tolerance and against prejudice; but the time is approaching for a test of the meaning of that preference.[3]

Insofar as the civil rights movement has proceeded beyond the call for brotherly love or for equality, it has ventured upon unsure ground. Civil rights demands in Alabama and Mississippi are comprehensible; the promises of personal security, the ballot, and decent schools are familiar and long overdue. But the issues blur in the newer context of New York or Chicago or Atlanta where these minimal gains are well on the way to attainment. There the failure to define appropriate goals has created future difficulties, the shape of which is already apparent. The new problems are important not only because an increasing percentage of American Negroes live in an urban environment, but also because the range of decisions involved will confront the nation long after the difficulties of the rural South are resolved.

(270) In the earlier stages of the struggle for equality, it was enough to ask that the government be color-blind. The barriers that confined the Negro were the products of law, and it was necessary to demand only the equal treatment that the Constitution guaranteed. Desegregation was the response to segregation; and it was a response that attracted the support not only of other underprivileged minorities but also of many Americans who found it in accord with their own creed of individual dignity and equality of opportunity.

In the past decade, emphasis has gradually and imperceptibly shifted from desegregation to integration, but without adequate awareness of the consequences and often with a profound ambiguity about the nature of the desirable goal.

The term integration sometimes refers to the openness of society, to a condition in which every individual can make the maximum number of voluntary contacts

with others without regard to qualifications of ancestry. In that sense, the objective is a leveling of all barriers to association other than those based on ability, taste, and personal preference.

But integration sometimes also refers to a condition in which individuals of each racial or ethnic group are randomly distributed through the society so that every realm of activity contains a representative cross section of the population. In that sense, the object is the attainment, in every occupational, educational, and residential distribution, of a balance among the constituent elements in the society.

In crucial matters of public policy, antithetical consequences follow from the two positions. The one calls for improvements in the Negroes' opportunities for jobs, housing, and schooling even though the group may remain as separate as before; the other puts a primary emphasis upon racial balance.

The civil rights movement has never made a clear choice between these alternatives, nor has any spokesman fully articulated the implications of the two points of view. But increasingly in the past five years, the thrust has been in the latter direction, toward an organization in which every sector of society is racially balanced; and it is in that sense that the term integration will be used in the discussion which follows.

In part the change of recent years was due to the very intensity of the struggle against an intransigent opposition. More important, however, was the perception that the leveling of governmental barriers (271) was in itself inadequate to remove the handicaps under which colored people labored. The vicious cycle of slum housing, poor schools, lack of skills, and low income trapped the urban Negro and widened rather than closed the gap between him and others in the society. Deprivation became a pattern of life that hopelessly handicapped him in the competition for desirable places. The simple neutrality of government would not relieve him of these shackles; positive action to compensate was essential. The state was

to intervene to assure the disadvantaged a due proportion of well-paying jobs and to balance the population of neighborhoods and schools in a thoroughly integrated pattern. That assurance was deemed necessary to restore equality to the disadvantaged. Hence the campaigns to destroy *de facto* segregation in the public schools, to secure preferential hiring and job quotas for Negroes in industry, and to manage housing in the interest of mixed residential neighborhoods.

This profound shift in the tactics of the civil rights movement during the past decade has come without any clear estimation of the consequences. To clarify those consequences, it is necessary to resolve the ambiguities in the goals of the civil rights movement. Is the ultimate objective to eliminate the differences that actually divide the population of the United States and thus dissolve its people into a single homogeneous and undifferentiated mass? Or will it be possible to reach toward equality while retaining the social subgroupings produced by a heritage of diversity and by the problems of managing a free population of almost 200 million? The answer, upon which the welfare of all Americans rests, should, to a greater degree than in the past, influence the tactics of the civil rights struggle.

The view of integration as racial balance rests on two fallacious assumptions—that the position of the Negro is absolutely unique in the American experience and that racist prejudice is so thoroughly ingrained in the people of the United States that only positive exertions by the government will assure the colored man his rights. Neither proposition conforms to the evidence.

The Negro is unique, it is argued, because his color sets him off from the majority more decisively than the traits of other ethnic groups did and because slavery crippled him so seriously that he cannot compete on equal terms and needs a crutch to help him along.

(272) Certainly slavery was a more traumatic experience than the centuries of persecution, the hardships of migration, and the generations of depressed proletarian

existence from which the Irish peasants suffered. But the argument slights the Negro's powers of recuperation and exaggerates the extent to which the damage caused more than a century ago remains a permanent part of his character. There has been a tendency to underestimate the extent of his achievements even in the fifty years immediately after emancipation, under conditions immensely more difficult than those of the present. When one considers the backwardness of the Southern economy after 1865, the exclusion from political power, the racist prejudices, and the bitterness left by a great war, it was a respectable accomplishment to have formed stable family units, to have developed productive skills, and to have created an array of churches, lodges, and media for cultural expression, with the limited resources the group possessed. Few people released from bondage in any society have performed as creditably.[4]

The disadvantages from which the Negro suffers in 1965 are less the products of the plantation than of the great migration to the city in the past fifty years; and that experience he shares with the other ethnic groups who have participated in American urbanization. Of course the Negroes are different from the Poles or Italians or Jews, just as those peoples differ among, and from, each other. The differences, however, are not of kind but of degree, and they are largely explained by the recency of arrival of the colored men, by their greater numbers, and by their dense concentration in a few cities. The problems of prejudice and acculturation from which the most recent newcomers suffer had their counterparts among the earlier arrivals.[5]

Nor is color the sole and unique sign of ethnic visibility. It is no doubt the most prominent mode of social recognition; but much depends upon the social assessment of this as of other physical traits. The Japanese-Americans are far less visible in 1965 than they were in 1940 although their color has not changed. And the Kennedys are still identified as Irish after five generations in the New World, and despite their wealth, prominence, and whiteness.

The assumption that color has a unique differentiating quality rests upon the argument that American society is inherently racist, its promise of equality reserved only for the white man. It has become fashionable in the past few years to sneer at Myrdal's statement of the American creed of equality and to urge that only (273) forceful measures will restrain the propensity to prejudice.

There was a racist period in American history in the sixty years after the end of the Civil War; but the hatreds of that period were peculiar to the time and place. Much more significant is the deeper tradition of equality before and since that interlude. The agony with which slaveholders like Thomas Jefferson and George Mason considered their own situation, the tortured efforts of early scientists to understand color differences, and the torment the abolitionists caused in the North and the South were the results of the inability to square the existing labor system with the belief in the brotherhood of man and the commitment to equality. And the changes since 1945 have been the result not of fear either of the Negroes or of Africans but of the awareness that equality is a necessary ideal of the Republic.

Furthermore, the Negro, while the most prominent, was not the sole target even in the racist period. Prejudice was not limited by race, creed, national origin, or previous condition of servitude. The majority of the victims of lynchings in those years were Negroes; but there were 1,293 white victims of the rope and faggot as against 3,436 black. Italians in New Orleans, a Jew in Georgia, and Greeks in Omaha also met the fury of mob violence. The Ku Klux Klan of 1924 was more concerned with Catholics and Jews than with colored men.[6]

Above all, the response of Americans to the crisis of the past decade reveals the effectiveness of the appeal to the creed of equality. Even Bogalusa is not South Africa; and the inability of the open advocates of racism to attract support is the best evidence of the extent of commitment to that creed.

In estimating the meanings of integration, therefore, it is entirely appropriate to examine the analogous if not identical experience of other ethnic groups. Their process of acculturation will throw light on the need for defining the goals and the strategy of the civil rights movement.

Barring a major overturn of the American social system, which at the moment appears neither probable nor desirable, change will come within definable limits and will involve choices among alternatives. And decisions on this matter will be more effective if they come within an informed context that makes it possible to envision their results.

The inequities which survive from the past cannot be understood or remedied without a comprehension of the social order that (274) produced them. They are the pathological manifestations of a mechanism of adjustment which permitted that order to function. Their successful removal requires a consideration of the function they serve; otherwise, the alternatives are grim. Either the order will collapse to the injury of everyone, white as well as black, or else uncontrolled alternative modes of adjustment will recreate and perpetuate the diseased condition.

This was the error of most of the abolitionists, who thought they could extirpate slavery without considering the effects upon Southern society. The result by 1900 was the restoration of the Negro's subordination in other forms than slavery.[7]

Hence, the importance, in any effort to foresee future developments, of an understanding of segregation, of its relationship to equality, and of the probable effects of integration.

Popularly speaking, segregation was a response to the dissolution of earlier forms of stratification. In a slave regime, the physical separation of the dominant and subordinate populations was superfluous and inconvenient. In other relatively static societies, where places were rigidly defined and the symbols of status clearly fixed by law or custom, groups could mingle with considerable promiscuity because there were no problems of recognition and

no dangers to the established hierarchy of persons and groups.[8]

In the South, segregation was a response to the abolition of slavery and to the threat to white superiority posed by Reconstruction. The pattern that emerged in the last quarter of the nineteenth century used the law to fix the identity of the Negroes and to confine them to inferior social places. To those ends it established a rigid etiquette of behavior and separate institutions that restricted the opportunities of the former slaves for education and employment. Within the limits thus established, residential separateness was unnecessary. The measures that implemented segregation were deliberate on the part of the whites; the purposes were clearly understood at the time. As for the Negroes, their wishes were of no consequence; once they were excluded from political power, violence induced their acquiescence. The result was a kind of order, the price of which was inequality of rights.[9]

In the freer, more fluid, and more mobile sections of the country, segregation was achieved by withdrawal rather than by restraint and was voluntary rather than compulsory. As the Northern cities expanded with the influx of waves of heterogeneous newcomers, the old residents moved away, and the new arrivals sorted themselves **(275)** out in neighborhoods that reflected their own sense of community. Education, employment, religious affiliation, and associational life fell within lines that were not imposed by law or by violence but were shaped by informal and largely spontaneous connections of kinship or community.

Although the Northern Negro suffered from prejudice as did the Southern, society was not polarized but fragmented; and he found himself but one of many groups comparably situated, some of which suffered from disabilities similar to his own. Negroes did not confront a homogeneous white community with a single chain of command leading up to a unified leadership. They found a place among numerous communities, each with its own power structure and its own leaders.[10]

The function of separateness in this context was not to establish or to perpetuate the inferiority of one group, but rather to accommodate diverse patterns of life that were the products of differences in ethnic and sectional heritage, or in economic and social background. By reducing contacts at the points of potential tension, this adjustment permitted each group to organize its own institutions without the oversight or interference of others, and yet was flexible enough to preserve some degree of order in a highly complex society. Furthermore, the expanding cities possessed enough free space and their organization was so loosely articulated that individuals who preferred not to affiliate could refrain from doing so and could get along in whatever degree of detachment they wished. The ghetto arrangement was therefore totally different in intention as well as in form from the segregation of the South.

Indeed the fact that the pluralistic order took account of actual differences within the population made it possible to preserve the *concept* of equality. Not every man was equally qualified in terms of inherited capital, cultural traits, personality, and intelligence to pursue equally the goals of success in American life. But the pursuit of happiness was not a single, unified scramble in which every individual sought the same prizes and in which only a few could be winners while the rest were doomed to frustration. In the stated beliefs of the society, every boy could grow up to be President—of the United States or at least a railroad. Americans could cling to faith in that useful proposition because they never subjected it to the test of practice. In reality the disparity of aspirations and career lines drew only a few persons into the competition for those lofty places while relatively independent subsystems, with their own (276) values and rewards, provided satisfying alternatives to many more. The children of Irish or Italian parents did not count themselves failures if their lives did not follow a course identical with that of the children of the Yankees. They had their own criteria of achievement and their own sources of gratification.

The result was to take the edge off the harshly competitive psychological and social conditions of an open society. Pluralism permitted the deployment of the population in an intricate network of relationships and associations that facilitated cooperation at some points, but that left large areas free for the withdrawal of individuals and groups and that therefore minimized conflict-provoking contacts. There were manifestations of prejudice, discrimination, and occasional violence among many of the ethnic and occupational groups. Measured against the potential explosiveness of the situation, however, those were relatively minor. Until the migrations of the past half-century, Negro life in Northern cities was not essentially different from that of other ethnic groups. It had some distinctive problems as every other group did; but relatively small numbers and generally favorable conditions permitted an accommodation on essentially the same terms.

Neither in the North nor in the South is integration in the sense of racial balance a meaningful guide to proximate future action. Desegregation is likely soon to eliminate the vestiges of discrimination inherited from the Jim Crow era; and it may open the way to full participation by Negroes in the political and economic life of the nation, but it will do so within the terms of some approximation of the group life already developed. Integration, defined as the elimination of differences, on the other hand, demands of both Negroes and whites an impossible surrender of identity. The deletion of all memory of antecedents, the severance of all ties to the past, and the liquidation of all particularistic associations is not only unfeasible but undesirable. It would curtail the capacity of this society to deal with its problems under the conditions of freedom; and significantly some of its advocates are either altogether nihilistic or else do not flinch from the totalitarian methods and consequences that would be involved in achieving this version of integration.[11]

Only a small minority of Negroes, however, think in these terms. The vast majority understand that they are a group and will remain so; they seek an expansion of

their rights and opportunities, but (277) show neither a desire to merge with the whites nor any expectation that that will soon happen. Desegregation is a genuine issue; racial balance is a vague and confusing abstraction that turns their attention away from the genuine political, economic, and social problems they and other Americans confront.

The issue is perhaps clearest in the field of political action. No right is more basic than that to full and equal participation in the governmental process; and Negroes were quick to exercise the privileges of citizenship once they secured access to the ballot either through migration to the North or through the leveling of barriers in the South. Apathy was no more widespread among them than among other voters new to the suffrage. The colored people promptly assimilated the techniques of machine organization, and their power has increased steadily as their numbers have. With the appearance of a second generation, native to the city, they have begun to move into elective office at about the same pace as their predecessors did.

Three related factors continue to limit the effectiveness of their use of political power. The lack of competent leadership has enabled self-serving hacks and demagogues to push to the fore and has wasted on the quest for petty privilege the effort and energy that might have gone into improving the status of the whole group. The modes of collaboration with other blocs of voters have been slow to develop; and since the Negroes remain a minority, the ability to use their strength depends on alliances with others. Finally, Negroes have had difficulty in perceiving where their true interests lay when it came to such complex questions as education, urban renewal, and economic policy. In all three respects, they are repeating the experiences of earlier groups drawn into the processes of American democracy.

Nor is it to be expected that these people will be more enlightened in the use of power than their predecessors. Politics is not the cure-all that some naive observers consider it to be.[12] Post-Civil War Negroes in the South did

not use their strength any more effectively than did the Irish of Boston in the first quarter of the twentieth century. The same sentimental temptation to idealize the underdog that once built up exaggerated expectations of the proletariat now sometimes leads to hopes for a panacea in the activities of the Negro citizen. There is no more reason to expect political wisdom from the black than from the white resident of a slum or from either than from the suburban commuter. The vote is not an (278) abstract exercise in either intelligence or benevolence but a means of exercising influence on the processes that shape governmental decisions. For some time yet, Negroes will use it to serve narrowly defined group interests.

The removal of surviving restraints on the right to vote is obviously important; but integration is an irrelevant distraction which disperses energy and inhibits the development of responsible leadership which can take a full and active role in politics at every level. Political effectiveness will grow not through the weakening of the sense of identity but through the development of institutions that can clarify the group's interests, provide organized means of ascent to leadership, and retain the loyalties of the growing middle-class and professional elements in the colored population.

Integration in the sense of the elimination of distinctiveness is no more relevant to the economic plight than to the political plight of the mass of Negroes. The demands for preferential hiring, for assigned quotas of desirable jobs, and for a Black Man's Marshall Plan are sometimes presented as if they were the means of attaining racial balance and therefore of furthering integration. Actually, they are calls for the recognition of the special character of the group; and to the extent that they are heeded, they strengthen identification with it.

Measurement of the rate of Negro progress is difficult because of the recency of this migration to the cities and because gross comparisons of whites and nonwhites distort the actual situation. A large proportion of urban Negroes have been where they are less than twenty years, almost all of them, less than fifty years. The analogous migration

from Eastern and Southern Europe began in the 1890's and reached its peak between 1900 and 1910. The mass of Poles, Italians, and Russian Jews even in the prosperous 1920's, much less in the depression 1930's, had not made more rapid progress. Furthermore, the limitations of the census categories which recognize only whites and nonwhites obscure the genuine differences in occupation and income among the former and make comparisons invidious. Unfortunately, more refined data are difficult to come by.

It is undeniable, however, that a large percentage of American Negroes are confined to unskilled and poorly paid occupations at a time when technological changes reduce the demand for their labor. They therefore suffer more than do other sectors of the (279) population from unemployment, low incomes, and the consequent social deprivations. Furthermore, the same economic forces that contract the demand for their services and their position as late arrivals prevent them from developing the protected trades through which other groups maintained quasi-monopolistic control of some employment opportunities.

The difficulty is that no occupation in the United States—hod-carrier, teamster, machinist, shopkeeper, physician, or banker—ever represented a cross-section of the whole population. The social and cultural conditions that influenced recruitment to these callings did not prevail identically in all ethnic and sectional groups. Entirely apart from prejudice or discrimination, therefore, the chances that a given individual would follow one career line rather than another were likely to depend on an environment and on connections shaped by family influences.

Conceivably this pattern of recruitment could change. Since Jefferson's day, various utopians have dreamed of a mandarin system within which all infants start on equal terms and are directed by successive competitive tests of ability to their appropriate niches in life. This is the ultimate model of integration; and it would certainly put Negroes on terms of parity with all others. But, desirable

or not, this solution is visionary. It is hardly necessary to attempt to estimate the social and psychological costs of such a system or even to speculate about the difficulty of defining ability (intelligence?) in that context. The dominant tendencies in American life have consistently broken down any effort to create the rigid controls upon which development in that direction depends. The likelihood is slim that those tendencies will change enough in the near future to offer any promise of relief to the Negroes' problems.

A general assault on the problems of poverty may, in time, mitigate the difficulties from which Negroes suffer along with the other unskilled and therefore superfluous elements in American society. But some Negroes at least are not content to wait for that happy outcome and are struggling now for better chances as a group. Pressure on employers to assign a quota of desirable places to colored people may result in a kind of tokenism, advantageous to a few without easing the hardships of the many. But such adjustments do help the few; and both the tactic and its outcome sustain and strengthen the sense of group solidarity. There are already contexts—in some levels of government employment, for instance— **(280)** in which there is an advantage to being black, a condition which puts a premium on affiliation with the group.

In the last analysis, the welfare of the Negroes depends upon the health of the whole economy and its capacity to produce and distribute goods according to an acceptable pattern. But the last analysis is remote indeed. In the interim, the Negroes will use what power they can muster as a group for their own advantage. Preferential treatment in some high-prestige forms of employment will be justified not because it will improve the lot of the great mass of the unskilled, but because it is a means of opening some avenues of escape for the most qualified. At relatively little cost in efficiency, this device can create a pool of potential leaders with a stake in social order and at the same time break the identification of the race with poverty.

Hence the importance of education upon which, increasingly, access to the more desirable places depends. The Negroes started with the initial disadvantage of dependence on the weakest schools in the country—those of the South. Migration compounded their difficulties, and the environment of poverty adds to their handicaps. The need for improvement is unarguable.

The methods of effecting that improvement are by no means clear, however. The pressure for integration has called attention to the problem; but it has also confused the solution. For some elements in the civil rights movement, integration in the form of racial balance has become an end in itself more important than the quality of the schools. Martin Luther King's hit-and-run involvement in this issue in Boston, Chicago, and Cleveland shows the danger of the thoughtless transference of the tactics of one kind of struggle to another.

Partly this outcome is the result of the historic development of the school issue in the South, where segregation was a means of perpetuating educational inequality and Negro inferiority. There desegregation was an essential step toward equality. However, the slogans of that effort were uncritically applied to the separateness of the Northern schools which had an altogether different function. The imbalance of the Northern schools was not designed to create or maintain Negro inferiority; and its result was not always to lower the quality of the education available to colored people.[13] Yet there was no forethought about the consequences of the attempt to end what came to be termed *de facto* segregation.

Furthermore, in this matter, there is a striking division of opinion (281) among Negroes, covered up by the appearance of unity on such occasions as the school strikes. The most vocal persons in the civil rights movement are the most mobile, those whose aspirations reach furthest, those most irked by the identification of their color. Integration expresses their not fully understood desire to sever their ties with the past; and racial balance is a means toward that end.

This desire does not reach very far among the mass of Negroes. In such cities as New York and Boston, where open-enrollment plans offered parents an opportunity to send their children outside the districts of their residence, only a very small minority chose to do so. However the lack of response may be explained away, it reveals the limited scope of the appeal of racial balance.

Yet this issue in many places has overshadowed the far more important factors that enter into the Negroes' educational deprivation. And it is likely that time and energy will continue to be dissipated on the question of racial balance that might more usefully be expended on the quality of the schools and on the orientation of the educational process to the needs of the colored students.

The demand for racial balance has sometimes had a blackmail effect; it has forced concessions on municipal authorities willing to spend more heavily on slum schools than they might otherwise have in order to stave off the drive for bussing. But this tactic has also had the adverse effect of exaggerating the deficiencies of schools in Negro neighborhoods and thus of frightening away experienced teachers, of hastening the flight to the suburbs and increasing the rate of withdrawal to private and parochial schools. The insistence upon integration is thus self-frustrating, as the experience of Washington, D. C., shows. Further pressure toward racial balance will certainly weaken the public schools and leaves the Negroes the greatest sufferers.

The dilemma is unnecessary. There is no evidence that racial balance itself improves the capacity of the underprivileged to learn; nor that the *enforced* contact of dissimilar children has significant educational advantages. There is abundant evidence that deprived children have distinctive needs that require the special attention of the school. Yet the drive for integration has obscured, and sometimes actually impeded, the task of providing for those needs. Indeed the argument is now often being made that racial balance is desirable to meet the needs of white children.

Here, too, an awareness of the groups' identity and a determination to deal with its problems is the most promising path to equality. (282) The Negro deserves preferential treatment in education because his needs are great. But to receive it calls for the recognition of the special character of his situation, not for costly efforts artificially to commingle his children with others in the interest of the ideal of balance.[14]

Since the desegregated, but unintegrated, school is a neighborhood school, there is a relationship between the range of residential choices and the conditions of education. The Negroes suffer from poverty, from their recency of arrival, and—in housing, more than in any other sphere—from prejudice. It remains unfortunately true that some whites willing to work side by side with the Negro or even to vote for him in an election will boggle at accepting him as a neighbor. That hesitation is connected with the fact that the residential district, especially in the middle-class areas of the city, is also the setting of a distinctive communal life, with group-derived values and activities of its own. The presence of any outsider is a potential threat, exaggerated in the case of the Negro by fears of a mass inundation.

Something has been done—by law and persuasion—to quiet these fears; a good deal more can be done by these methods. But it would help if the fearful were aware that there is no widespread desire among Negroes for residential intermixture as such. Colored people are primarily concerned with the quality of housing; they do not value highly propinquity to whites. Talk about racial balance not only distorts the actuality of Negro intentions, but it heightens the very fears that may limit the freedom of the occasional black family that wishes to move to a mixed neighborhood. A recent study of middle-income Negro families, for instance, expressed surprise at the preference for ghetto residence and suggested that whites be moved in to encourage integration, as if that were a necessary and desirable end in itself. A state legis-

lative committee on low-income housing uncritically adopted the same goal. These proposals repeat the errors of New York City's experiment with benign quotas which deprived Negroes of the quarters they needed in order to save room for whites, all out of the concern with balance.[15]

Integration is a false issue. The problem is housing—how can adequate space up to present-day standards of decency be made available to the poor? How can all other colored families get fair value up to the level of their incomes, without being penalized for their race? For most Negroes these are the primary issues. They are (283) difficult enough without the complications of racial balance. The control of the urban renewal process, the role of government as entrepreneur, and problems of design and form will set the framework within which the character of the Negroes' future housing will be determined. And group cohesiveness will be of great importance in influencing decisions in these matters.

The development and strengthening of Negro communal institutions may also help normalize the situation of the colored family. The disorderly features of that position are well known—the absence of a male head, frequent illegitimacy and dependence—as well as their relationship to juvenile delinquency, crime, and narcotic addiction. But these characteristics have been too readily associated with the effects of the slave heritage. The servitude of the plantation may have left elements of weakness in the families of the freemen; but the extent to which sound family life developed among the Negroes between 1865 and 1915 is impressive, as is the extent to which it still prevails in the rural South closest to the slave setting.

A more plausible source of disorder is the effect of rural-urban migration with low income and slum housing at its destination. That correlation conforms to what is known about the changes in family life in other societies in which slavery has not been a factor.[16] It conforms also to the experience of earlier groups of migrants to American cities. Less than a half-century ago, the foreign-born resi-

dents of Irish, Jewish, or Polish slums faced comparable problems of matriarchal households and delinquency.

It was not alone the tradition of solidarity and discipline that contained the damage among these peoples, but also the fact that their families were encased in social and cultural institutions which imposed restraints upon recalcitrant individuals, established norms of behavior, and disposed of weighty sanctions for conformity. Negroes have been slower to develop similar institutions, partly because this migration came at a moment when government absorbed some of these functions, but also because in their experience separation meant segregation and bore the imputation of inferiority. Yet those men who, in the name of integration, deny that there is a significant role for the Negro press, or for Negro churches, or for Negro associations are also denying the group of its media for understanding, for expression, and for action. They would thereby weaken the capacity of the people who need those media to act on their own behalf.[17]

(284) It is the ultimate illogic of integration to deny the separateness of the Negro and therefore to inhibit him from creating the communal institutions which can help cope with his problems. Delinquency, poverty, slums, and inadequate housing of course concern all Americans; and the attempt to eradicate them calls for common efforts from every part of the nation. But history has given the Negroes a special involvement in these matters; and to deny the actualities of the group's existence is to diminish its ability to deal with them. To confuse segregation, the function of which is to establish Negro inferiority, with the awareness of separate identity, the function of which is to generate the power for voluntary action, hopelessly confuses the struggle for equality.

Clarification of the goals of the civil rights movement has immediate tactical implications. Desegregation is not the same as integration; Selma is not Harlem, Bogalusa, not Chicago.

Where violence, exclusion from the ballot, or state power has deprived the Negro of his equal rights as a man

and a citizen, it is his obligation and that of all other Americans to demand an immediate end to the discriminatory measures that aim at his subordination.

Desegregation will not solve any of the other important economic, social, and political problems of American life; it will only offer a starting point from which to confront them. The inadequacies of the political system, unemployment, inferior education, poor housing, and delinquency will still call for attention. In some of these matters the peculiarities of the Negroes' situation call for special treatment. But with reference to none of them is integration a meaningful mode of action; and the call for it which echoes from a different struggle on a different battleground only produces confusion.

Whatever may happen in the more distant future, Negroes will not merge into the rest of the population in the next few decades. Those who desire to eliminate every difference so that all Americans will more nearly resemble each other, those who imagine that there is a main stream into which every element in the society will be swept, are deceived about the character of the country in which they live. As long as common memories, experience, and interests make the Negroes a group, they will find it advantageous to organize and act as such. And the society will better be able to accommodate them as equals on those terms than it could under the pretense that integration could wipe out the past.

(285) References

1. I have treated the background of this problem in greater detail in *The American People in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954); *Race and Nationality in American Life* (Boston, 1957); and *Fire-Bell in the Night* (Boston, 1964).
2. The civil rights movement is neither unified nor represented by a single spokesman. The attitudes here discussed reflect a trend expressed in statements of individuals. There are helpful collections of these views in Harold R. Isaacs, *The New World of Negro Americans* (New York, 1963); and Robert Penn Warren, *Who Speaks for the Negro?* (New York, 1965). For the background, see Richard Bardolph, *The Negro Vanguard* (New York, 1959); August Meier,

Negro Thought in America 1880-1915 (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1963). On the extremists, see Irving Howe, "New Styles in 'Leftism,'" *Dissent*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Summer 1965), pp. 312, 314, 318 ff.

3. See, for example, *New York Times*' survey of whites' attitudes, September 21, 1964; Dean Harper, "Aftermath of a Long, Hot Summer," *Transaction*, Vol. 2, No. 5 (July-August 1965), pp. 9, 10.
4. Reconstruction literature generally focuses on the failures and the missed opportunities rather than on the achievements. See E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro in the United States* (New York, 1957), pp. 135, 142; W. E. B. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction in America* (New York, 1935).
5. Oscar Handlin, *The Newcomers. Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis* (New York, 1959).
6. Walter White, *Rope & Faggot* (New York, 1929), pp. 20, 227, 230 ff.; James E. Cutler, *Lynch-Law* (New York, 1905), pp. 170 ff.; J. E. Coxe, "New Orleans Mafia Incident," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (October 1937), pp. 1067 ff.; Theodore Saloutos, *Greeks in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), pp. 62-69.
7. See Dwight L. Dumond, *Anti-Slavery* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1961); Martin Duberman, *The Antislavery Vanguard* (Princeton, N. J., 1965), pp. 137 ff.; James M. McPherson, *The Struggle for Equality* (Princeton, N. J., 1964); Willie Lee Rose, *Rehearsal for Reconstruction* (Indianapolis, Ind., 1964).
8. See Frank Tannenbaum, *Slave and Citizen* (New York, 1946); Stanley M. Elkins, *Slavery* (Chicago, 1959).
9. C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow* (New York, 1957) describes the process.
10. See T. J. Woofter, *Negro Problem in Cities* (New York, 1928), pp. 177 ff.; Howard Brotz, *The Black Jews of Harlem* (New York, 1964); John Daniels, *In Freedom's Birthplace* (Boston, 1914), pp. 133 ff.; W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Philadelphia Negro* (Philadelphia, 1899), pp. 197 ff., 389 ff.; St. Clair Drake, *Churches and Voluntary Associations in the Chicago* (286) *Negro Community* (Chicago, 1940); St. Clair Drake and Horace R. Cayton, *Black Metropolis* (New York, 1962), Vol. I, pp. 174 ff.
11. See, for example, Howard Zinn, *SNCC, The New Abolitionists* (Boston, 1964), pp. 216-241.
12. For example, Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in Black and White* (New York, 1964).
13. A misleading impression is often the result of gross comparisons of selected Negro schools or school districts with a general white average. It is necessary to take account also of variables other than race that affect performance. An

analysis of achievement in Boston district high schools, for instance, shows that schools in certain white neighborhoods are as deficient as those in Negro neighborhoods (reported in *Boston Globe*, December 14, 1964, pp. 1, 13).

14. There is abundant evidence that significant improvement can come in the performance of Negroes in desegregated but racially unbalanced schools. The Banneker experiment in St. Louis, the experience of Washington, D. C., and the results in Louisville, Kentucky, point to the same conclusion. Of course, improvement can also come in balanced schools. However, the essential element is not balance, but the allocation of adequate educational resources to compensate for the disadvantaged situation of the Negro. See also Frank G. Dickey, "A Frontal Attack on Cultural Deprivation," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 45, No. 8 (May 1964), p. 398; *New York Times*, May 17, 1965. A good deal of the literature is summarized in T. F. Pettigrew, *A Profile of the Negro American* (Princeton, N. J., 1964), although the conclusions drawn are different.

15. Lewis G. Watts, et al., *The Middle-Income Negro Family Faces Urban Renewal* (Boston, 1964); Massachusetts Special Commission on Low-Income Housing, *Summary Report* (Boston, 1965), and *Final Report* (Boston, 1965), House Document 4040, p. 10.

16. See, for example, B. A. Pauw, *The Second Generation: A Study of the Family among the Urbanized Bantu in East London* (Cape Town, Union of South Africa, 1963); Raymond T. Smith, *The Negro Family in British Guiana* (London, 1956).

17. See, for example, Louis E. Lomax, *The Negro Revolt* (New York, 1962), pp. 204, 205.

"SLUMS AND SUBURBS"

by James Bryant Conant.*

A commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The present volume is based primarily on observations made during my study of education in the junior high school years, which was financed by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. The results of that inquiry have been published elsewhere. Those who assisted me were Messrs. M. P. Gaffney, F. O. White, and E. A. Dunham. I am indebted to them for their contributions to this book, particularly to Mr. Dunham, who rewrote and rearranged a considerable portion of the first draft and collaborated closely with me in the preparation of the final manuscript.

James B. Conant

A Study of the American High School
588 Fifth Avenue
New York 36, N. Y.
June 14, 1961

---

* Former U. S. Ambassador. A.B. Harvard 1913, Ph.D., 1916. Holder of more than fifty honorary degrees from colleges and universities both in America and abroad. Dr. Conant served Harvard College as the Theodore Richards Instructor in Chemistry and became a full professor in 1927. He was chairman of the chemistry dept. from 1929-33, retiring in 1953. He served as U. S. High Commander for Germany 1953-55. From 1955 until 1957 he held the post of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the new Federal Republic of Germany. He then became a Carnegie Grantee for a study of U. S. High Schools. Dr. Conant has been very active in writing in the field of American education. Publications in the field include: *Education and Liberty, The Citadel of Learning, The Child, the Parent and the State, The American High School Today, The Education of American Teachers, Recommendations for Education in the Junior High School Years,* and *Shaping Educational Policy.* A few of Dr. Conant's awards and honors include: Commander Legion of Honor (France), Commander Civil Division Order of British Empire, Medal for Merit, Oak Leaf Clusters, Freedom House Award, and Woodrow Wilson Award.

Introduction

This is a book of contrasts. I shall present a picture of two totally different kinds of neighborhoods and the public schools which serve them. I shall discuss city slums and wealthy suburbs. In the large metropolitan areas of New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, and St. Louis, one has no difficulty in locating examples of both. In some cases twenty minutes' or half an hour's drive will enable a person to go from one to the other. A visit to the high school serving each community will open the eyes of a visitor to the complexities of American public education. Within the limitation imposed by the budget, the schools in the two totally different neighborhoods may be doing a good job. Yet their basic problems are in many respects quite unlike. And the differences spring from the differences in the nature of the families being served. One lesson to be drawn from visiting and contrasting a well-to-do suburb and a slum is all important for understanding American public education. *The lesson is that to a considerable degree what a school should do and can do is determined by the status and ambitions of the families being served.*

In the suburban high school from which 80 per cent or more of the graduates enter some sort of college, the most important problem from the parents' point of view is to ensure the admission of their children to prestige colleges; consequently there is great concern over good teaching of academic subjects. From the educator's point of view, however, the most vexing problem is to adjust the family's ambitions to the boy's or girl's abilities. In the city (2) slum, where as many as a half of the children drop out of school in grades 9, 10, and 11, the problems are almost the reverse of those facing the principal and guidance officer of the rich suburban school. The task with which the school people in the slum must struggle is, on the one hand, to prepare a student for getting and keeping a job as soon as he leaves school and, on the other hand, to encourage those who have academic talent to aim at a profession through higher education. The task

thus stated seems simple. In actual fact the difficulties are appalling. So appalling, indeed, that as I prepared to spell them out in my final report to the Carnegie Corporation, I decided to write a small book devoted largely to their consideration.

I have done so because I am convinced we are allowing social dynamite to accumulate in our large cities. I am not nearly so concerned about the plight of suburban parents whose offspring are having difficulty finding places in prestige colleges as I am about the plight of parents in the slums whose children either drop out or graduate from school without prospects of either further education or employment. In some slum neighborhoods I have no doubt that over a half of the boys between sixteen and twenty-one are out of school and out of work. Leaving aside human tragedies, I submit that a continuation of this situation is a menace to the social and political health of the large cities.

The improvement of slum conditions is only in part a question of improving education. But the role of the schools is of the utmost importance. As I hope to make clear in later pages, the school authorities ought to be given the responsibility for helping out-of-school youth between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one both to further their education and gain employment. Added responsibilities, however, require additional funds. Indeed the whole problem of financing public education in the large cities is a major national concern.

The contrast in money available to the schools in a (3) wealthy suburb and to the schools in a large city jolts one's notions of the meaning of equality of opportunity. The pedagogic tasks which confront the teachers in the slum schools are far more difficult than those which their colleagues in the wealthy suburbs face. Yet the expenditure per pupil in the wealthy suburban school is as high as $1,000 per year. The expenditure in a big city school is less than half that amount. An even more significant contrast is provided by looking at the school facilities and noting the size of the professional staff. In the suburb

there is likely to be a spacious modern school staffed by as many as 70 professionals per 1,000 pupils; in the slum one finds a crowded, often dilapidated and unattractive school staffed by 40 or fewer professionals per 1,000 pupils. The contrast challenges any complacency we may have about our method of financing public schools—even within a rich state like New York.

In the first three chapters of this volume I present a picture of the schools in the slums of the big cities that my staff and I have visited. Then follows a discussion of the very different problems facing the school authorities in some of the well-to-do suburbs in large metropolitan complexes. These areas include the ten largest cities in the nation—New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Detroit, Baltimore, Houston, Cleveland, Washington, and St. Louis. Within each area, one finds, of course, a broad spectrum of communities, and I am presenting the picture only of the extremes. In doing so I shall confine myself to public school problems, leaving aside the important fact that parochial schools in the large cities enroll a large fraction of the school population—a third or more in many cities.

My first report dealt with the comprehensive high school in small independent cities that were not part of a metropolitan complex. I classify as independent such cities as Elkhart, Indiana, Mansfield, Ohio, and Bakersfield, California, because in terms of their economic and social life (4) they are largely self-sufficient. With a population of 10,000 to 60,000, such a city generally has only one senior high school. It may or may not have a local community college. Because the city is an industrial center, the shop facilities in the high school will be used at night for an extensive apprentice program for high school graduates. Employment opportunities are, for the most part, local. A labor-management committee advises in regard to the various programs offered with federal Smith-Hughes funds, including the programs in grades 11 and 12 in the high school. The school board represents the entire community, and under favorable conditions the parents and

various civic groups feel that the schools are honestly run for the benefit of all. Indeed the citizens may feel great pride in their school, although, alas, this pride is all too often symbolized by the marching bands and the successful football and basketball teams.

In the small independent cities and the consolidated rural districts the widely comprehensive high school functions as an effective instrument of democracy. All the youth in the community are enrolled and there is a variety of elective programs. These are reasons why I chose to focus my attention on such schools in preparing my first report. Any school that enrolls most of the youth in the community can be said to be comprehensive. The degree of comprehensiveness turns on the variety of elective programs. The metropolitan areas of the country, the subject of the present volume, are almost without high schools that, in regard to the curriculum, are widely comprehensive. This is true whether one turns to a suburb or, with few exceptions, to a large central city. What do I mean by this statement? I mean that it is difficult for a youth in a metropolitan area to find high schools which offer a wide range of significant vocational programs—unless he goes to specialized technical or vocational high schools. In the suburbs there is relatively little demand for vocational education. (5) In the big city there are no labor-management advisory committees comparable to those characteristic of the small independent cities. Those that exist serve the vocational high schools; the employment area is too large, diverse, and complicated to be surveyed by any one committee.

In no school district within a great metropolitan area is there the sense of social and economic cohesion such as one finds in a small city. One has only to note the difference in the composition of the Rotary Club to see what I have in mind. The leading Rotarians in the small independent city usually live and have their principal business in the city. The community, while socially heterogeneous, is yet a viable social and economic unit. In a suburban town or city, however, the Rotary Club is often composed

of those who are not the richest or the most influential business and professional men in the community, because the business leaders who live in the suburbs work in the city and may belong to the Rotary Club in the city.

Perhaps some may think these differences trivial. I assure the reader that in terms of understanding public education they are not. They are significant both on their own account and as evidence as to the kinds of school districts which the public secondary schools must serve in the metropolitan areas. They affect the financing of the school, the composition of the school board, the relation of the parents to the school, and the chief problems of the elementary as well as the secondary school.

I estimate that a third of the high school population of the country resides in the large metropolitan areas, but by no means all this number attend the prosperous suburban schools. Nor do all in the large cities within these areas attend slum schools. Many high schools within each city are, except for the vocational programs, very much like the comprehensive schools which are described in *The American High School Today* and which enroll a third of the (6) high school population. Finally, a third of the high school population still attends high schools, generally in rural areas, that are too small to offer satisfactory education, particularly to the more able students. Though enrolling only a third of the student population, these schools represent 80 per cent of all public high schools in the United States. The number one problem in many states is elimination of small schools by further district consolidation. I should not like to attempt to match the seriousness of this problem on a national basis with the problem of the big city slum schools on which I am focusing attention in this book. They both present challenges to our American belief in the principle of equality of educational opportunity. Only through aroused public sentiment can these and related pressing problems be solved to the benefit of the public welfare of the United States.

(7)

CHAPTER I

City Slums and Negro Education

In this and the next two chapters I shall consider the special educational problems facing school boards, administrators, and teachers in the big central cities of our largest metropolitan areas—especially New York, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and St. Louis.

In each one of these cities one can find neighborhoods composed of various minority groups. Many of these are areas now designated as "culturally deprived" or "culturally different," but in my youth they would have been more simply designated as "slums." In particular one finds large Negro neighborhoods and often somewhat smaller areas made up entirely of Negro slums. The schools serving such neighborhoods must be visited in order for one to understand the nature of the difficult tasks which the teachers face.

The Status of the Negro

The slum areas of certain big Northern cities are today largely inhabited by Negroes who have recently moved from the South hoping to improve their lot. The economic changes in the South which have forced this migration are too well known to require elaboration. The Negro is being displaced as a farm laborer and, being unable because of discrimination to obtain other employment in the section where he was born, he becomes a migrant headed North. Between 1950 and 1960 the percentage of Negroes living (8) in the South dropped from 60 to 52 per cent. St. Louis is said to be the first stopping point for many who make the journey, though the school people in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Washington, and New York indicate that their problems with the recently arrived Negroes from the South are quite as great as those which confront their colleagues in St. Louis. New York State now has the largest Negro population of any state in the Union.

Since I am going to be completely frank about Negro

education in the largest cities, it may be well to take a few paragraphs to set forth my own interpretation of the distressing history of the Negro in the United States. At the outset I must make it plain that I approach the delicate and complex problem of interracé relations with the background of a one hundred per cent New Englander. My family tradition was that of the strong abolitionists. My mother, who remembered the Civil War, used to say that as a child she was brought up to think Negroes were if anything better than white people. It is as difficult for me to imagine myself in the position of the well-educated Southerner who in the 1850s argued for Negro slavery as it is for me to understand how intelligent Germans in the 1930s ardently supported Hitler. Yet the fact of the matter is that in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries a great many citizens of the United States with high principles and broad education believed that "the peculiar institution of the South" was not only constitutionally justified but morally correct.

As I read the history of the United States, this republic was born with a congenital defect—Negro slavery. Or, if one prefers another metaphor, we started life under a curse from which we are not yet free. To be sure, slavery was recognized by at least some of the Founding Fathers as an abominable inheritance from the past. Many hoped the institution would disappear within a generation. We must remember, however, that even the author of the Declaration (9) of Independence, who advocated emancipation, also advocated the colonization of the freed Negro slave *outside* the United States. For otherwise, he said, "Deep-rooted prejudices entertained by the whites; ten thousand recollections by the blacks of the injuries they have sustained; new provocations; the real distinctions which nature has made; and many other circumstances, will divide us into parties, and produce convulsions, which will probably never end but in the extermination of the one or the other race." The idea of the Negro and the white living together peacefully on equal terms in a free society was literally inconceivable to Jef-

ferson. Yet after nearly two hundred years we are endeavoring to accomplish the building of just that type of society. We make a great mistake, I believe, if we fail to recognize the rough and weary road we have had to travel in our attempt as a free and independent people to remove the social consequence of the inherited curse of Negro slavery.

In spite of the acceptance of the principles of the Declaration of Independence, the makers of the Constitution wrote in the fugitive-slave provision as part of the compromise to satisfy the South, and as late as 1813 Congress explicitly referred to "citizens of the United States *or* persons of color, native of the United States," thus emphasizing that freed Negro slaves were not citizens. The Missouri Compromise, "bleeding" Kansas, the Dred Scott decision of the Supreme Court in 1857, the devastation of the Civil War, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments—these are but a few of the historic markers of the truly frightful journey of a people believing in the novel doctrine of the American Revolution yet caught in the morass of Negro slavery. After the victory of the North, a vindictive Congressional majority tried first to solve with force a moral and sociological problem and then gave up. The people of the United States through their duly elected representatives in Congress (10) acquiesced for generations in the establishment of a tight caste system as a substitute for Negro slavery. A majority of the Supreme Court struck down what attempts were made to use the federal power to loosen the bonds of race prejudice and supported a doctrine of equal but separate facilities. As recently as 1932 a national commission which included a leading Negro educator spoke of improving the education of the Negro entirely in terms of obtaining federal support for separate schools. Equal educational facilities were demanded but not a word was written about desegregation.

As one reviews the events of the last hundred years and squarely faces a multitude of unpleasant facts today, the temptation to indulge in the fantasy of rewriting his-

tory arises. I cannot help regretting that the "black Republicans" of the 1860's by being so revengeful, precipitate, and corrupt in their attempts at reconstruction, prevented the moderate group from constructive acts favorable to the status of the Negro. If Congress had acted favorably on President Grant's recommendations of 1875 and the necessary number of states had agreed, an amendment to the Constitution would then and there have established a federal policy as to public education. Each state would have been required to maintain free public schools open to all irrespective of race, color, or creed, and, interestingly, no public funds at any level could have been used for the "benefit or aid, directly, or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination. . . ." Even if the presence of federal troops had been necessary to get such a system of desegregated schools under way, the ultimate result would, to my mind, have justified this harsh reconstruction measure—"making it the duty of each of the several States to establish and forever maintain free public schools adequate to the education of all the children in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits." Today any state, by changing its constitution, could close all its (11) public schools—both segregated and integrated schools—and there is little that could be done at the federal level to prevent it.

As we now recognize so plainly, but so belatedly, a caste system finds its clearest manifestation in an educational system. By the same token, in the critical days when slavery had just vanished and caste lines were not yet established on a new basis, a system of free public schools for Negroes and whites together might have softened the caste lines even if a majority of pupils attended all-white or all-Negro schools. Above all, the existence of such schools, guaranteed by the power of the federal government, might have assured the eventual establishment of a corps of Negro and white teachers working together for the betterment of the recently liberated Negro slaves. To be sure, most of the white teachers would have come from the Northern states at first, and

normal schools for both races would have been required. The principle of an integrated teaching staff, however, would have been established. And once such a staff had been established in at least some of the former Confederate states, the whole problem of Negro education would have been viewed in a different light.

I might note parenthetically that the significance of the status of the Negro teacher is not always fully appreciated by those who discuss the Negro problem. Yet what differentiates Chicago from Atlanta, let us say, is not only that there are mixed schools as well as all-Negro schools in the Northern city, but that one finds a dedicated group of Negro and white teachers working together harmoniously on a set of difficult tasks. In a Southern city, the most one finds are formal conferences of the Negro and white teaching staffs; and often such conferences, quite common before the Supreme Court decision in 1954, are no longer held because of the state of public opinion.

The "might have beens" of the past are probably profitless to consider. Segregated schools and staffs were (12) established all through the South. The Constitution of the United States was not amended. For nearly a hundred years our ancestors—North and South, East and West—accepted, almost without protest, the transformation of the status of the Negro from that of a slave into that of a member of a lower, quite separate caste. The present situation is a consequence of a national policy, or rather the lack of a national education policy, which has persisted for generations. We now struggle with the consequences, and one of these is the situation in the Northern cities to which I am directing the attention of the reader.

I shall not discuss education in those many communities where segregation is still the policy of the school authorities. In all the cities to which I shall refer, the schools either have been desegregated for generations or were desegregated shortly after the decisions of the Supreme Court in 1954 and 1955.

Aptitude and Background

Before proceeding with this discussion, I must insert a few paragraphs to dispose of a common fallacy which one often hears privately even in the North. This is to the effect that it has been clearly established that a colored student on the average is inherently inferior to a white student. No such generalization has been established, and in my view the difficulties in obtaining evidence that would validate or, for that matter, clearly negate such a position are virtually insurmountable. However, it has been established beyond any reasonable doubt that community and family background play a large role in determining scholastic aptitude and school achievement. Anyone who thinks they do not simply has not visited widely among American schools.

Within such a city as Chicago, or Detroit, or New York, for example, the figures showing the distribution of scores on scholastic aptitude tests in different neighborhoods (13) are most revealing. In one of these cities the average score of the eighth-grade pupils in a school in a relatively well-to-do, stable residential section is 123; in another neighborhood of about the same size but composed entirely of people of low socio-economic status, the average score is only 76. The average score city-wide is 100. It is true that in the section that shows up so poorly in these scholastic aptitude tests there are many, many Negroes. But there is no way of deciding whether the low score is related to the color of the pupils' skins or the low socio-economic condition of the entire group.

A very important fact not to be overlooked is that the comparison of average scores leaves out of account the overlap of scores that, as far as I know, is found whenever such comparisons are made. There are always some Negoes who score better than most whites and some whites who score lower than most Negroes. Important, too, is the fact that such a test correlates highly with reading ability. Children who for one reason or another have learned to read will do better on this kind of test than children who have not learned. In the suburban school practically all the children read well; in the slum school few do.

In view of the influence of cultural background, a word is in order on the validity of the commonly used "intelligence" or scholastic aptitude tests. In recent years, the paper-and-pencil tests measuring intelligence or scholastic aptitude have often been attacked because they are considered to be unfair to underprivileged children. Indeed the whole concept of intelligence tests is distasteful to some Negro educators whom I have met, not only because the test which is commonly used to measure I.Q.s reflects the cultural level of the family, but also because the whole idea of an intelligence quotient is considered too deterministic. To assign an I.Q. to a child at an early age is to brand the child. On the last point, I think one must admit that, as originally developed and used by many educators (14) in the 1920s and 1930s, intelligence tests were thought of as measuring the inherent or genetic qualities of the individual. The evidence at first available seemed to indicate that the chances of a single individual's I.Q. changing over the years were slight. Today, however, when we tend to think of paper-and-pencil intelligence tests, at least in the higher grades, as measuring a type of scholastic aptitude, we are well aware that we are measuring an aptitude which in part has been developed in the school. The difference between an I.Q. test and a good achievement test is one of degree not kind. Understood in this sense and with evidence accumulating that an individual's aptitude score may change during his school years, there is nothing deterministic about the use of the various forms of intelligence or aptitude tests which are on the market. If they are understood only as giving a prediction of *probability* of academic success in subsequent schoolwork, they are no more and no less influenced by home or other environmental factors than are the marks for schoolwork given by a conscientious teacher.

In this regard, one wonders at the purpose that would be served by establishing so-called culture-free tests which, it is asserted, would discount the cultural bias in the group paper-and-pencil intelligence tests. Whether

such a test can be devised is itself a question. Granting that one could have a test that showed equal results with children of widely divergent socio-economic backgrounds, the results would serve little useful purpose, since schools exist in a society that does have cultural biases. As a knowledgeable person in testing has said, "If a child does poorly on an aptitude test because he comes from the wrong side of the tracks, it isn't the test that is being 'unfair,' it is the hard facts of social circumstance that are unfair. Anyone who is seriously interested in improving the lot of the culturally underprivileged should direct his attention not to changing the tests—which would accomplish literally nothing—but to improving (15) the quality of educational opportunity for all children."

Whenever aptitude test scores are cited, it must be borne in mind that their *only* valid use is to make rough predictions of future success in academic work in school. On this basis, most of the pupils in the Negro slum school will have a very difficult time with their future schooling. This is not to say that no effort should be made to upgrade both the aspirations and achievements of slum children. Quite the contrary; good teachers are never defeatists. Dedicated school people in city slums in every city have the goal in mind to raise the sights, ambitions, and academic skills of children with low scores on tests of scholastic aptitude. They have this goal precisely because they realize that even though the betting odds are against their success, there is always a chance that at least some boys and girls with hopeless school backgrounds and low I.Q. scores will show dramatic progress. This happens time and again—but more of these success stories in later chapters. At this point, let me say that although it is my belief that students should take as wide a program of academic studies as they can handle, one must not be deluded into thinking that miracles can be worked with any large numbers of children. Aptitude test scores, marks of conscientious teachers, achievement test results—these reliable predictors of academic success indicate the enormity of the task of teachers in slum schools.

In considering the relative abilities of whites and Negroes, let us examine the situation in an *all-white* slum in a city of considerable size. Perhaps the greatest handicap to good school work is the high mobility of the population in the neighborhood. It is not uncommon in such a school to have a turnover of the entire enrollment in one school year. A careful study of a group of children in grade 4 of one such school showed that their average achievement level was a full year below their grade placement—a typical situation in any slum area.

(16) What the teachers in this school have to contend with is shown by a report from the principal, who writes:

"When a residential area composed of large, old homes formerly occupied by owners and single family groups changes economically and socially, conditions of general deterioration begin. Absentee owners rent the property by single rooms or small so-called apartments of two or three rooms to large families. . . . Such conditions attract transients (who either cannot or will not qualify for supervised low income housing), the unemployed, the unskilled and unschooled, and the distressed families whose breadwinners have either just been committed to prisons or mental institutions or who have but recently been released from such. The only possession most of these families have is children. . . In such an environment all forms of evil flourish—the peddling of dope, drunkenness, disease, accidents, truancies, physical, mental and moral handicaps, sex perversions involving children. . . .

"The parents of at least one-third of the children are either in penal institutions, are on probation, or have prison records. At least 100 children are on probation to the Juvenile Court. There has not been a day since I've been at the school that there has not been one or more children in detention at the Juvenile Court. . . .

"Unless a school is able to educate its children so they may become competent and responsible citizens its work is a temporary stopgap that relieves immediate suffering only. Although the school is the only organization that has

instruction as its primary responsibility, when a noble hearted teacher faces a barefoot, hungry, sick, distressed child, the result is an endless chain of efforts to relieve such a child.

"We realize that little or nothing can be done for or with the parents of the children who face such serious problems in their homes. These problems directly affect the child's health, attendance, emotional and personal adjustment, his learning and his progress (or lack of it) in (17) every respect. In all probability at least one-half of our children will be school dropouts. In our opinion the children need, desperately, for desirable development, in addition to good schools—good homes, churches and communities."

I am quoting from an official report which, in acknowledging the generally low achievement of the white children in this school, makes the interesting statement that "There is no reason to believe that these students as a group are inherently or genetically less capable than average students, but apparently because of some types of experiences in their lives they have been unable to develop their intellectual skills." The belief expressed in the first part of this sentence can hardly be based on anything firmer than an assumption as to the genetic uniformity of white children whose ancestors have for several generations lived in the United States. Such an assumption, of course, leaves out of account the possibility of a selective process occurring over the generations as some tended to move to one type of occupation and settle in one type of community. However, since I see no way of investigating the role of selective migration, I would be inclined to let the assumption stand unchallenged. *Only I would argue strongly that to date we have no evidence to indicate that the assumption should not be broadened to include* both *white and Negro students.* For all the contrary evidence, namely the poor work in school and low scores on tests made by Negroes, is based to a large degree on the performance of children in what are essentially slum conditions.

In short, until we have a great deal more data about test scores and school records, especially with respect to large numbers of Negro children from stable high-income communities, I for one would reserve judgment as to the answer to the question whether there is a correlation between race and scholastic aptitude. And until the evidence is available, I suggest the only assumption to use as a working hypothesis is that there is *no* genetic or inherent difference (18) as far as aptitude for schoolwork is concerned between large numbers of Negroes in the United States and large numbers of other children.

Elementary Schools in Negro Slums

With this background sketched in, I can now take up the educational problems in the Negro slums of certain of our largest cities. I wish that I could do more than take them up. What I should like to do is to create in the reader's mind a feeling of anxiety and concern. For without being an alarmist, I must say that when one considers the total situation that has been developing in the Negro city slums since World War II, one has reason to worry about the future. The building up of a mass of unemployed and frustrated Negro youth in congested areas of a city is a social phenomenon that may be compared to the piling up of inflammable material in an empty building in a city block. Potentialities for trouble—indeed possibilities of disaster—are surely there.

Let me describe a slum that might be in any one of several of the large cities I have visited. The inhabitants are all Negroes and with few exceptions have entered the city from a state in the deep South anytime within the last month to the last three years. Often the composition of a school grade in such an area will alter so rapidly that a teacher will find at the end of a school year that she is teaching but few pupils who started with her in the fall. I recall the principal of one school stating that a teacher absent more than one week will have difficulty recognizing her class when she returns. This comes about because mothers move with their offspring from one rented room to another from month to month and in so doing often

go from one elementary school district to another; I am told that resident tenements look more like transient hotels. I write "mothers" advisedly, since in one neighborhood, (19) by no means the worst I have seen, a questionnaire sent out by the school authorities indicated that about a third of the pupils came from family units (one hesitates to use the word "home") which had no father, stepfather, or male guardian. This particular section was by no means homogeneous, of course. For while many moved about from room to room, a quarter of the parents reported that they owned their homes. Only 10 per cent of the parents had graduated from high school and only 33 per cent had completed the elementary school. Contrast the situation in which a third of the parents have completed elementary school with that in a high-income suburb where as many as 90 per cent of the parents have bachelor's degrees, if not graduate degrees from a university.

These Negro slums seem to vary considerably with respect to the social mores. In some there are very bad gangs with gang warfare among the boys. There are also vicious fights outside of school between Negro girls. The condition in one such neighborhood was summed up to one of my staff by a principal of a junior high school who said even he was shocked by the answers to a questionnaire to the girls which asked what was their biggest problem. The majority replied to the effect that their biggest problem was getting from the street into their apartment without being molested in the hallway of the tenement. He went on to say that the area had a set of social customs of its own. The women, on the whole, work and earn fairly good wages, but the male Negro often earns less than the woman and would rather not work at all than to be in this situation. As a consequence, the streets are full of unemployed men who hang around and prey on the girls. The women are the centers of the family and as a rule are extremely loyal to the children. The men, on the other hand, are floaters, and many children have no idea who their father is. Similar reports from principals and teachers can be heard by the attentive and sympathetic

visitor to the Negro slums of (20) any one of several cities. Racial discrimination on the part of employers and labor unions is certainly one factor which leads to the existence of so many male Negro floaters. What is terrifying is that the number of male *youth* in this category is increasing almost daily.

I have so far referred only to white and Negro slums. A few words are necessary to point out that in some cities, New York in particular, there are slum areas inhabited by recent arrivals from Puerto Rico. In these sections, the problems are similar to those I have been describing but complicated by the difference in language. Unlike the American Negro from the South, these recent arrivals bring with them a set of social mores closely associated with their own methods of communication. At the same time, they often, if not always, come with children whose schooling has been bad. Clearly the task of educating these Puerto Rican children involves both a reading and a foreign language problem. These problems are so special I shall not attempt to discuss them here. One hardly needs to point out that their existence adds one more complication to the tasks confronting the administrators and teachers in the New York City schools. Add to these problems the possibilities of interracial hostility and gang warfare between Negroes and Puerto Ricans and the resentment of both toward the whites, and one has a veritable witches' brew which comes to boil with unsavory violence in certain schools in certain areas—particularly in the junior high school years. The amazing feature of the whole situation is that pupils make any progress in schools in some areas of the city.

One needs only to visit such a school to be convinced that the nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreck havoc with the school and the lives of children. The community and the school are inseparable. For example, I have (21) walked through school corridors in slum areas and, looking into classrooms, have seen children

asleep with their heads on their hands. Is this situation the result of poor teachers without either disciplinary control or teaching ability? No, the children asleep at their desks have been up all night with no place to sleep or else have been subject to incredibly violent family fights and horrors through the night. Checking into one case, a principal told one of my staff that after climbing six flights of a tenement he found the boy's home—one filthy room with a bed, a light bulb, and a sink. In the room lived the boy's mother and her four children. I might add that it is not unusual for teachers in these schools to take home with them children with no place to go at night. The social attitudes found in this kind of slum neighborhood are bound to affect the atmosphere of the school. As one Negro teacher said to me, "We do quite well with these children in the lower grades. Each of us is, for the few hours of the school day, an acceptable substitute for the mother. But when they reach about 10, 11, or 12 years of age, we lose them. At that time the 'street' takes over. In terms of schoolwork, progress ceases; indeed many pupils begin to go backward in their studies!"

I ask the readers of this volume, many of whom live in wealthy suburbs, to ponder the contrast between the lives and the education of their children and the lives and education of the boys and girls in the neighborhoods I have been describing. It is after visits to schools like these that I grow impatient with both critics and defenders of public education who ignore the realities of school situations to engage in fruitless debate about educational philosophy, purposes, and the like. These situations call for action, not hair-splitting arguments.

Those who are deeply concerned with the education of the children in these slum areas are not waiting for others to change the social setting in which the schools operate. They are tackling the problem of getting the boys (22) and girls from the poorest families to learn to read and write and do arithmetic. Foreign languages in grade 7 or algebra in grade 8 (recommendations in my junior high school report) have little place in a school in which half the

pupils in that grade read at the fourth grade level or below. Homework has little relevance in a situation where home is a filthy, noisy tenement. Discipline, of course, is a problem. Many educators would doubtless be shocked by the practice of on-the-spot demotion of one full academic year, with no questions asked, for all participants in fights. In one junior high school I know of, a very able principal found so intolerable a situation that he established that very rule. As a consequence, there are fewer fights in his school among the boys, many of whom at one time or another have been in trouble with the police. In this school and in many others like it one finds the boys wearing ties and jackets to school, if not their one Sunday suit. When spoken to in the classroom, they rise to recite. Passing time between classes may be as short as one minute in order to preserve order in the halls. The school attempts to bring some kind of order to otherwise chaotic lives. And what is important, this formal atmosphere, at least in one school I know of, appears to work. School spirit has developed, and efforts are now being made to enlist the interest of the parents in the education of their children, who must stay in school till they are sixteen and whom the school will try to keep in school till graduation to prevent unemployed, out-of-school youth from roaming the streets.

In contrast to what one hears about "blackboard jungles," I think I am fairly safe in saying that the outward manifestations of discipline, order, and formal dress are found to a greater degree in the well-run slum schools of a city than they are in the wealthier sections of the same city. The contrast is especially noticeable between city slum schools and wealthy suburban schools, where informality in dress, deportment, and classroom procedure is the rule. (23) I doubt that many suburban parents would stand for the regimentation and formal discipline meted out in many slum schools. It is not accidental that that part of the progressive movement in education which rebelled against formalism and authoritarianism found root in the suburban and private schools.

I should like to record at this point my impression of what my colleagues and I have seen in slum sections of big cities. Almost without exception we have seen white and Negro teachers and administrators struggling tenaciously and bravely against the adverse influences of the home and the street. As one of my associates who had spent the best years of his life as a principal of a suburban public high school put it, "I visited junior high schools in New York City in some of the worst areas. I expected to find blackboard jungles; instead I found schools with high morale, tight discipline, imaginative principals and teachers. My visits to New York City junior high schools," he went on to say, "have provided some of the most interesting and exciting experiences I have had. In bad neighborhoods with children from hopeless backgrounds these schools are really doing a magnificent job." My own visits were largely confined to similar schools in Chicago, Detroit, and St. Louis, and my admiration for what is being done in those cities is equal to that of my colleague for what he saw in New York City.

The Importance of the Home

In the slum school, the development of reading skill is obviously of first importance. The earlier the slow readers are spotted and remedial measures instituted, the better. Indeed, the same rule applies as well to any school, but in the heavily college-oriented suburb, the number of slow readers is relatively small and teaching children to read by no means looms so large and difficult a problem as it does in (24) the slums. Some commentators have failed to recognize the relation of the reading problem to the socio-economic and cultural level of the home. Evidence on this point is found in the large cities. Essentially the same methods are used in all the elementary schools in a city, and yet the average grade level of reading in the sixth grade, for example, may vary as much as two grades from one school to another. Concern with improving the reading of the pupils, particularly the slow reader, must continue well beyond the elementary school.

Different administrators and teachers in various cities are tackling the problem of teaching reading in somewhat different ways. My associates and I were very favorably impressed by the effort that was being made in many of the cities we visited. Just how far up the reading scale one can hope to bring the majority of pupils in a slum neighborhood is an open question. The factors working against all forms of intellectual effort are powerful negative influences to overcome. Since the degree of influence of these negative factors varies from child to child even in the same neighborhood, and the neighborhood's social climate changes from year to year, sometimes from month to month, it would be very difficult to obtain significant figures if an analysis of the social factors were attempted. One can only report that in spite of the Herculean efforts which are being made, there are many ninth-grade students in certain large city schools—in some as many as a half—who are reading at a sixth-grade level or lower. It must be remembered, however, that because of the high family mobility very few of these youth have had the advantage of the special attention given to reading in the lower grades in the same city.

In one school I visited, the teachers themselves, mostly Negroes, felt that the only way to improve the reading of the children in the first three or four grades was to do something with their mothers. If the head of the family unit (25) could be located and brought into communication with the school, attempts were made to stimulate an interest in newspapers, magazines, and possibly even books. One of the troubles, the teachers said, is that when the children leave the school they never see anyone read anything—not even newspapers. "If we could change the family attitude toward reading, we could accomplish much." With this statement one must heartily agree and likewise agree that even a slight change, which was all that was expected, would probably be reflected in the reading ability of the children.

In other all-Negro schools, this point was made again and again. Therefore many such schools use social workers

or visiting teachers to keep the parent or parents in touch with the school. This is not always an easy task, for the almost illiterate parent may be frightened of anyone officially connected with education. But if the parents can be induced to adopt a positive attitude toward the school, a first step has been taken. If the reading of some sort of printed material can be started, the way is open for the more usual forms of adult education courses. It may be that only by a greatly increased expenditure of funds on adult education can the present blocks to children's educational progress be removed in the most depressed areas of the large cities. Trials of new procedures and imaginative approaches to a complex social and educational problem are certainly in order.

In connection with the difficult task of teaching reading, it is well worth pointing out that without the development of modern testing what is now being accomplished would be quite impossible. I am convinced that fifty years ago in all communities, and even fifteen years ago in many schools, the slow reader was not identified or, if identified, was just ignored. Today in all the larger school systems, reading tests are given in most grades, and the reading level of each pupil and the average of each grade are carefully recorded. This procedure has proved its value. Unlike the (26) I.Q. scores, it is clear what the reading level tests try to measure. Furthermore there is a mass of evidence that, by remedial work, a child may improve his standing on such a test. What is of prime significance in all the larger schools is that remedial measures *are* taken to improve the reading level of those who have some ability but are far behind the average for their age.

At the risk of being unduly repetitious, I must emphasize that for the last few pages I have been discussing, for the most part, Negro *slums*. To suppose that all Negroes live in such neighborhoods, even in the large cities, would be to make a totally unwarranted inference from what I have reported. A trained sociologist would perhaps be able to characterize every block of city tenements in terms of a series of concepts developed in recent years by his col-

leagues. Presumably to do so would require an extensive survey. As a first approximation to the data which would be thus obtained, one can use the information supplied by the principals of the public schools serving the different, and usually adjacent, Negro neighborhoods. Particularly significant are the readings levels, the scholastic aptitudes and achievements in grades 7 and 8, and the dropout rate after grade 8. Using such criteria, I know that one will find gradations of Negro neighborhoods in a number of the large cities, just as one finds a similar gradation in white neighborhoods—running from slums to well-to-do residential sections. Furthermore, in some sections of some cities, at least the upper grades will be mixed white and Negro, reflecting of course a mixture of races in the larger geographic area from which the upper grades draw their pupils. In such schools, I am told, it is usual to find far more whites than Negroes in the group that scores high on aptitude and achievement tests. At first sight such facts might be taken as evidence as to the inherent superiority of the white children for academic work, but anyone who has observed even casually the situation of the Negro in the large (27) cities and who knows the influence of the family on the school performance of the children will see the fallacy of any such conclusion. The position of the family in the *total* community, in this case the entire city, and the past performance of the friends and relatives of the family in getting a job and obtaining recognition enormously affect the attitude of the parents toward intellectual tasks and the desires and ambitions of the children.

De Facto Segregation

In concluding this chapter, I should like to turn to a thorny subject of great concern to those interested in improving Negro education. This is the question of whether or not *de facto* segregation, as some like to call it, is detrimental to the education of the Negro. Closely related is a second question; namely, should the school authorities endeavor to move Negro children into purely white schools in order to have as many mixed schools as possible? The

issue is a very real one, and in a sense it is primarily political. At this point I must make reference to the Supreme Court decisions of 1954 and 1955 because of a tendency to regard them not only as the law of the land but as a sacred text on education. Clearly even a unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court fails to determine educational policy except within the framework set by the issues before the Court—in this case, the "segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race." It is necessary to point out this obvious fact, for I have heard the statment made that because the Supreme Court expressed the opinion that "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," all completely Negro schools are morally wrong and that there is essentially no difference between *de jure* segregation still found in almost all Southern communities and what some call *de facto* segregation in portions of the large (28) Northern cities. The point is important and deserves discussion.

If one turns to the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka* [347 U.S. 483 (1954)], one finds the sentence I have just quoted about separate educational facilities. Taken out of context, the conclusion might be drawn that the justices declared separate educational facilities *for whatever reason provided* are morally wrong and if supported by tax funds are illegal. Yet on reading carefully the whole opinion, I think the key sentence is the question defined by the Court: "Does segregation of children in public schools *solely* on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities? We believe that it does." I have italicized the word "solely," as I presume to think it is the essential word. The justices appear to have expressed no view as to whether the pupils in a completely Negro school are deprived of equal educational opportunity if they are not assigned solely because of their race. In short, if one group of children is separated from another group because of the neighborhood in which they live, the fact of this separation is, of and by itself, no evidence of an

inequality in education. Whether in fact the facilities and instruction are equal in a 100 per cent white school, a mixed school, and a 100 per cent Negro school in a large city is to be determined by examining the schools, not by appeal to phrases such as *de facto* segregation with the implication that it is to be condemned by all right-thinking people who condemn *de jure* segregation.

In some cities, political leaders have attempted to put pressure on the school authorities to have Negro children attend essentially white schools. In my judgment the cities in which the authorities have yielded to this pressure are on the wrong track. Those which have not done so, like (29) Chicago, are more likely to make progress in improving Negro education. It is my belief that satisfactory education can be provided in an all-Negro school through the expenditure of more money for needed staff and facilities. Moreover, I believe that any sense of inferiority among the pupils caused by the absence of white children can be largely if not wholly eliminated in two ways: first, in all cities there will be at least some schools that are in fact mixed because of the nature of the neighborhood they serve; second, throughout the city there ought to be an integrated staff of white and Negro teachers and administrators.

To insist that such solutions cannot be acceptable and to assume instead that the schooling of Negroes can be satisfactory only if in each schoolroom there are present some white children is to take an extremely defeatist view of Negro education in the large cities. The proposal to move any appreciable number of white children by bus into what are now Negro schools or to move all the Negro children in a Negro neighborhood into what are now white schools presents a transportation problem that is quite insoluble. An examination of the geography of the Negro and white sections of the large cities makes this evident. If some children are to be transported, the question arises which children and how many. I am not discussing here what seems to me to be a separate question; namely, the crossing of school attendance lines when waves of population movement create overcrowded conditions in one at-

tendance area and vacancies in another. Nor am I justifying the gerrymandering of attendance lines; such a procedure amounts to separating pupils *solely* on the basis of race.

At the elementary school level the issue seems clear. To send young children day after day to distant schools by bus seems out of the question. It must be remembered that unless by the accident of population migration there are empty seats in the predominantly white schools, white children (30) would have to be transported to Negro areas in order to free the necessary space. Clearly a complicated arrangement for moving large groups of young children around a city for the sake of mixing all the elementary schools is hardly worth discussing. At the high school level, the youth are certainly old enough to commute; one complication present in the elementary schools has disappeared. Still, a great network of transportation would have to be provided in a number of cities if the goal were to have every high school a mixed school. I have already noted the problem of determining the proper degree of admixture of white and Negro children. The more one considers the matter, the more one is convinced that children should not be manipulated for the purpose of seating Negro children in white schools or vice versa. To my mind, the city school superintendent is right who said he was in the education business and should not become involved in attempts to correct the consequences of voluntary segregated housing.

I know the argument is being made that crossing attendance lines should be permissive and without cost to the city and that the refusal of this right is a psychological blow to the pride of the members of the Negro race. But the reason for demanding such a privilege is the allegation that education in an all-Negro school to which pupils are not assigned *solely* on account of race is inherently inferior. Once this allegation is granted, the foundation for improving Negro education in the large cities is undermined. Since I believe the evidence indicates that it is the socio-economic situation, not the color of the children, which

makes the Negro slum schools so difficult, the real issue is not racial integration but socio-economic integration.

Put another way, if there is no inherent difference in potential ability, and if educational opportunity is equal, the poor achievement of the children in both the Negro and white slums which I described earlier may be ascribed to their depressing cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. (31) One might argue, therefore, that *all* slum schools ought to be integrated with schools in economically favored areas. If the body politic through its school board once sets out on a course of neighborhood desegregation, a good case can be made for transporting *white* children from slum schools to schools in high income residential districts and vice versa.

Much as I admire the comprehensive high school in the town with one high school and see it as an instrument of democracy, it seems impossible for school authorities in a large city to create artificially a series of such schools. If a policy were to be adopted that, as an ideal, every neighborhood school should have a widely heterogeneous school population represented by all socio-economic backgrounds, school administrators would be forced to move children about as though they were pawns on a chessboard.

If good schools can exist only with a heterogeneous student population, one could argue just as logically that state authorities should adjust all school district lines so that the high-income suburban high school would include students from a neighboring depressed area. Another impossible proposal. Antithetical to our free society as I believe *de jure* segregation to be, I think it would be far better for those who are agitating for the deliberate mixing of children to accept *de facto* segregated schools as a consequence of a present housing situation and to work for the improvement of slum schools whether Negro or white. The problems in these schools are far more difficult to solve than in other schools, larger and better staffs should be available, more money is required. It is my firm belief that actions based on the premises I have outlined are in the best interests of the Negro and of the nation. Through

the existence of at least some mixed schools, integrated teaching staffs, and increased expenditures in slum schools, I suggest that the education of Negroes in Northern cities can be made satisfactory and (32) their status improved. Another necessary step in upgrading the status of the Negro in the North is to take drastic measures to eliminate racial discrimination by labor unions and employers. This last observation leads me to a consideration of employment and secondary education in the large cities, which is the subject of the next chapter.

ARTICLE BY JIM HAMPTON FROM THE NATIONAL OBSERVER.

Dramatic Plans, Dramatic Protests in Chicago

HELLO TO BUSES, GOOD-BY TO NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

Chicago.

There's a storm blowing again through the schools of Chicago, where public education is spelled t-u-r-m-o-i-l.

The Chicago school system, second largest and among the most segregated in the nation, is already 54 per cent Negro. The percentage creeps up as Negroes displace whites from the city at the rate of 2.9 blocks a week. Unless something is done soon, demographers say, integration will be almost impossible by 1980.

The Board of Education and its new superintendent, Dr. James F. Redmond, are trying to do something. The board has adopted "in principle" a far-reaching plan that would eventually replace the neighborhood school with educational parks accommodating 20,000 students each.

It would also set up "magnet schools" in fringe residential areas; they would have superb facilities, top-flight teachers, and programs available nowhere else—all in an effort to slow the white movement to the suburbs and to give Negroes the quality education they are not getting now.

Busing Proposed

Last week the board got a taste of what its long-range plans may be up against. The board suggested busing Negro students from South Side schools to white neighborhood schools, and busing a few whites the other way; another 573 Negroes would have been bused from overcrowded West Side schools to predominantly white classrooms.

White parents went to court, failed to secure an injunction against the board, and then swamped the board's offices at 228 North LaSalle St. About 2,000 showed up, carrying placards like "Redmond, are you superintendent of education or transportation?" and "Let's bus Redmond out." The board postponed action on the busing plan for at least a month, and Mayor Richard J. Daley said the plan should be scrapped unless a majority of the parents in the affected areas endorse it.

The busing protest developed only hours after the board had staved off a threatened strike by its 23,000 teachers. The Chicago Teachers Union ratified a new contract that provides $1,000 pay raises by next fall and will cost $31,000,000 over the next two years. But now the city's full-time substitute teachers, who make up nearly 30 per cent of the total, are threatening to strike; they don't like the new contract's teacher-certification provisions.

These day-to-day crises, disruptive as they are, are insignificant beside the overwhelming difficulties that lie ahead for Chicago's schools. By changing the figures to suit the city, the names of many American cities would fit the same circumstances.

A Dramatic Increase

Like other big American cities, Chicago has been experiencing major growth in its Negro population. Real Estate Research Corp. (RERC), in projections made for the school board here, predicts that Chicago will be 42.9 per cent Negro in 1980, a dramatic rise from the 28.4 per cent in 1965.

The causes are familiar enough. Since World War II whites have flocked to suburbs, and Negroes and other minority groups have flocked to central cities. Between 1960 and 1965, the Census Bureau says, 96 per cent of all U. S. suburban growth was white; 87 per cent of all Negro population growth happened in central cities.

"If such growth continues to be concentrated within the city of Chicago," the RERC report says, "long-range stability of racial balance is impossible. For a city with a relatively fixed total population, capacity cannot have a stable racial balance if one group keeps growing rapidly; the other group *must* decline in size."

As long as children attend neighborhood schools, the racial balance of the neighborhood will determine the balance in the schools. In Chicago, *de facto* school segregation is exacerbated by extremely segregated housing patterns.

A Cross-Shaped Area

The city's Negro ghetto runs west, south, and north out of the Loop, in downtown Chicago. It is roughly cross-shaped, and the corners of the cross are what Stephen Rose, editor of Renewal magazine here, calls "two big nice, solid bungalow-type, Catholic, working-class neighborhoods. Along the lake [Lake Michigan] you have the well-to-do, high-rise, white business culture. When you talk about schools, you're not talking about the people who live along the lake shore; you're talking about these Catholic neighborhoods and these ghettos."

The Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago is the largest in the world. Its schools have more than 225,000

students, 27.9 per cent of the city's total. But only 10.3 per cent of the parochial schools' students are Negroes, and the proportion is holding steady. The "split" between public and parochial schools will remain at its present level, RERC projects, with the public schools getting 57 per cent of all white students and 93 per cent of the Negroes.

Obviously the burden falls on the public schools, which have set two goals for themselves. First, they hope to upgrade ghetto education by busing and by enticing more senior teachers into the core city's schools; both efforts have fizzled so far. Second, they hope to stem the white emigration by stabilizing, through magnet schools, fringe neighborhoods that will become all-Negro without extraordinary inducements to keep white families living there.

The Redmond Plan

Enter the Redmond Plan. This is the name given the document containing recommendations of several consultants that the board hired to suggest ways of increasing integration and improving ghetto schools. The study was made after the U. S. Office of Education told Chicago officials that they had to do something about their schools' *de facto* segregation.

At this point the plan is little more than that. The Board of Education accepted its recommendations in principle, and another consultant—Dr. Donald Leu of Michigan State University—is now studying the feasibility of the educational-parks idea. He said recently that the concept is the only workable prospect for salvaging Chicago's public schools.

Educational parks, as the Redmond Plan contends, may well be the only way to achieve integration in Chicago. "First," the plan says, "the park would draw from a much larger attendance area than a single school and thus include the full spectrum of ethnic, racial, economic, and social groups. Second, and related, minor-

ity students could no longer be viewed as the advance guard of a movement menacing the integrated neighborhoods, for the school would not be located by neighborhoods. . . ."

Instead, the parks would be scattered around the city, near arterial streets. Almost all students would be bused to school. The plan recommends 8 to 10 sites along Lake Michigan and 15 to 20 others elsewhere around the city, noting that "the effect upon integration of the areas chosen must be considered as crucial."

'A 30-Year Undertaking'

The parks idea "would be lunacy if conceived of as less than a 30-year undertaking," the plan says. It recommends building the first five over the next 8 to 10 years, adding parks at a one-a-year clip thereafter. "The addition of an average of one park per year serving 20,000 should permit the retirement from service of an average of 10 or more elementary schools and more than one high school per year," it adds, or more than 300 schools by the year 2000.

The plan continues: "All of this assumes a system of student assignment that will produce a close approximation of the over-all racial makeup of the community. Any such system must face up to the kinds of questions raised by past experience with assignment based on the student's own choice. Even if a shift to the park concept is justifiable on grounds unrelated to integration, it would be absurd to conclude 30 years of effort with the school system still segregated.

"With the advancement in transportation techniques that can be anticipated, the element of hardship for students assigned to more distant schools becomes of little consequence. . . . There would, in effect, be no neighborhood school to choose, and the difference between a 15-minute and a 25-minute ride is not so substantial as to constitute an unreasonable burden. The substantial objections to involuntary assignment outside the home neighborhood that exist under the present system of site selection tend to evaporate under the park concept."

Whatever its other qualities—and they are being hotly debated around the country—the educational park is expensive. Dr. Leu estimates that each park would cost Chicago $55,000,000; that would make a total cost of $1,375,000,000 for 25 parks, a stiff price even for an affluent school system.

Affluent, Chicago schools aren't. The system's 580 schools this year are operating on a $380,000,000 appropriation, or $647 for each of their 587,000 pupils; per-capita outlays in some suburban areas are $1,000 or more. James Moffat, one of Dr. Redmond's assistants, says the system's building needs already are estimated at $1.2 billion over the next 10 years. "Where are we going to get the money?" he asks. "Where is it to come from?"

Says Stephen Rose, editor of Renewal, a high-quality magazine focusing on urban problems: "This is a decent plan, but it comes 10 years too late. The obvious drawback—and this applies to the whole metropolitan problem—is that there's no darn money built into it. And the fact is that as long as the Vietnam War continues we are not going to have any money to spend on urban affairs."

Quality at Issue

Some observers contend that the primary problem in Chicago's schools is quality of education, not integration. They doubt whether integration is even possible, noting that the schools would be 54 per cent Negro even if each classroom had the white-Negro ratios of the system as a whole.

"We understand that in order to have completely integrated schools you would have to move 92 out of every 100 families in Chicago," says Ed Riddick, a Negro official of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago. While Negroes do not expect this to happen, he adds, they do see quality education as possible.

"Our initial comments about the magnet schools were that they were very promising as attempts to develop meaningful integration and to deal with the whole problem of educational quality. . . . Higher-quality education is desperately needed here in Chicago."

Mr. Rose agrees. "The problem is not just that the black kids are getting short-changed; they're getting fantastically short-changed," he says. "But what about all these white kids too? There are only two areas in the city where high-aspiration, professional white people will send their children to [public] school."

This shows up in enrollment figures. In 1963 Chicago had 190,000 Negro elementary students and 173,000 whites; this year there are 237,000 Negroes and 187,000 whites. The high schools had 42,000 Negro students in 1963 and 60,000 this year, while white enrollment has dropped from 80,000 in 1963 to 71,000 now.

No Single Solution

Dr. Raymond Mack, head of the sociology department at Northwestern University, says that "in cities like Chicago, stemming the flow of whites to the suburbs is the key. The trouble is, no one thing is going to do the job [but] the one way that you *can't* keep middle-class people in the central city is to let the schools deteriorate." The educational parks might be the answer, if the Board of Education decides that they are feasible. But it may be too late even for that, as Mr. Rose believes.

"What can you show me that can reverse the trend [toward Negro central cities]? I think the whole metropolitan area is becoming very tenuous as a unit in which people are going to want to make a long-term investment. People are really going to have to make a judgment on whether they will just phase out the existing city, or whether it can be saved."

—Jim Hampton

A THEORY FOR URBAN EDUCATION

by Robert E. Mason.*

From *Educational Theory*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1967).

(14) *The main thing wrong with education in the great cities has been wrong theory.* America comes up with the financial support when it is clear that a big job needs to be done and when there has been a clear proposal on how to do it. Our wars, especially World War I and World War II, and, among peace-time projects, the Interstate highway system, illustrate this if any illustrations are needed.

The wrong in theory of urban education has been neglect of context. General educational theory has been built mainly on notions regarding the characteristic course of human development. Even the challenge to traditional theories of human nature represented in the Darwinian movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries preserved the assumption that the development of man as man could be charted. Even John Dewey, who was much more aware of the cultural dimensions of personality development than his forebears, took the position that while both psychological and sociological aspects were involved in education, psychological considerations were always fundamental.[1] Thus, it is not surprising that despite the tremendous cultural diversity of the Great Cities, program and policy have at most points involved the assumption that the impact of such differences on children are accidental. That is, policies of admission, promotion, and academic progression have been set without regard to the differences from neighborhood to neighborhood.

---

* Robert E. Mason is Professor of History and Philosophy of Education at the University of Pittsburgh. He has taught in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Metropolitan Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Kansas City, Indianapolis, and Albany, as well as in Pittsburgh.

[1] John Dewey, "My Pedagogic Creed," in Martin S. Dworkin, ed., *Dewey on Education* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959), pp. 19-32.

Girls and boys have been admitted to the first grade of any school in any neighborhood in our Great Cities between the fifth and sixth birthdays. Chronological age has been the fundamental consideration in grade placement both for children who began their school work in the city and those transferring in from outside. At the age of 13 or 14, it has sometimes been expected that all children be sent on to junior high school for enrollment in the seventh grade. At one time New York City made this mandatory regardless of the academic standard achieved.[2] Being in a grade, it was held, should not mean having reached any fixed standard but rather having been in school a certain length of time and having attained achievement proportionate to ones ability.[3]

Children with retarded mental development and intellectually gifted children have been identified by tests of intelligence and judgment of teachers, and special administrative arrangements have been made for special grouping (15) and instruction of such children. Some special provision for "socially immature" and "slow learning" children has also been made. The idea has been to make it possible for children to advance with their age groups. Special classes have been provided for the mentally and physically handicapped, the socially immature, slow learners and intellectually gifted. By and large, all other classes have been organized on a flexible basis, with pupils of the same age together. It has been considered preferable to try to fit as many youngsters as possible into regular school classes made up of children of the same chronological age and verbal intelligence range.[4]

---

[2] New York (City) Board of Education, Association of Assistant Superintendents, *Study Guide on Policies and Practices Affecting Elementary Schools* (New York: City Board of Education, 1952), p. 6.

[3] New York (City) Board of Education, *Report of Committee on Articulation and Integration* (New York: City Board of Education, c. 1950), p. 6.

[4] See New York (City) Board of Education, *Study Guide on Policies and Practices Affecting Elementary Schools* (New York: City Board of Education, c. 1950), p. 27.

Developmental psychology, then, has provided the theoretical base for recent urban education. And some of the practices thus grounded in assumptions about human development *per se* have come to be looked upon as educational axioms. Yet developmental psychology is not necessarily and inescapably the central scholarly resource for a program of public education. Order in school administration does not demand absolutely that there be city-wide policies of admission and promotion based on chronological age. Neither chronological age, nor developmental age determined in some other fashion, are inescapable as the basis for grouping.

Developmental psychology as a field of study is itself shot through with value-judgments. The criteria in terms of which development is judged are used as criteria only because the culture, or a segment of the culture has placed a value upon them. Yet we have taken the so-called "developmental tasks" of children as revealed in psychological research as setting the appropriate standards and methods for elementary education. This has been the case despite all the talk about the relationship between school and society, learning and the context, individual and culture in response to Dewey and the progressive education movement. Mainly the talk about the social foundations of education by the social Deweyites was applied to large notions of social change to be implemented through education, rather than to pedagogy. The implications of the culture theory for pedagogy were never really explored, thus leaving the field to the psychologists.

If developmental psychology prevailed in elementary education, high schools in the big cities mainly continued to be organized either as academic preparatory institutions or as vocational training centers—specialized trade schools devoted to imparting specific job skills and vocational knowledge. Moreover, much of the reaction against progressive education took the form of an extreme emphasis upon the disciplines of thought and the importance of a central concern with intellectual development in educational endeavors. Various projects stemming from the grants of Ford money and resulting in an array of special

activities of educational import propose implementation of the values and interests of academic scholarship in the society for those who are capable, and specific job training for those who are not. Recent proposals of James Bryant Conant and Robert Havighurst make these assumptions. They both advocate more rigidly compartmentalized types of schools, streaming youngsters into quite carefully organized lines designed to impart authentic systems of knowledge and skill.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS

(16) John Osman, senior staff member of The Brookings Institution; addressing the Association of Urban Universities meeting in Louisville in November, 1962, warned that we have no urban philosophy even though the urban age is upon us. Using the flourishing professorship of Tokyo at the University of Tokyo as an example, he advocated that each American urban university establish a professorship of its city, e.g., a professorship of Louisville, Detroit, or Denver.[5] The fact that this has not been done in American universities as yet indicates the continuing failure of American scholars to face up to the realities of the contemporary urban condition. In the lower schools, particularly in the rural and small city context there was for a time a movement which partook of the point of view expressed by Osman in recommending professorships of the city. This was the so-called "community school" movement. It was worked out in considerable detail in Montana during Ernest Melby's presidency of the state university, and inspired works such as Baker Brownell's *The Human Community* and Poston's *Small Town Renaissance*. The theory is forcefully and beautifully presented in the posthumous publication of Joseph K. Hart's *Education and the Humane Community*. Lesser works describing innovations in lower schools in line with the community school emphasis were Samuel Everett, *The Com-*

[5] See Norman P. Auburn, "Problems of Urban Universities," *School and Society*, February 9, 1963, p. 73, for a brief report of the conference.

munity School, Elsie Clapp, *Community Schools in Action,* and Edward G. Olsen, *School Community Programs.* Two important Educational Policies Commission volumes reflected the emphasis, namely *Education for all American Youth* and *Education for All American Children.*

None of these works, with the possible exception of *Education for All American Children* took the Great City seriously. They saw the community as the more characteristic village or county seat city with a population of a few thousand people. In fact, there is a kind of pathos in the Joseph K. Hart work as Hart argues for the community as educator but deplores the disappearance of the small town which he thinks did a superb job of educating in an earlier day. Moreover, there is a good deal of sentimentality in most of these works, as if somehow the integration of school and community were to take place by simply increasing the physical movement back and forth between school pupils and adult members of the community.

But despite these features which weaken the applicability of the literature of the old community school movement to the contemporary urban scene, the underlying theme was a valid one and its adaptation to our thinking about education in the Great Cities is the clue to building an adequate and viable theory for urban education. This position has recently been taken explicitly by a Ford Foundation Associate, the Foundation not having been an organization unduly given to sentimentalism in its approaches to educational policy. Henry Saltzman, Program Associate in the Public Affairs Program Division of the Ford Foundation issued a strong plea for adoption of the theory and practice of the community school in the Great Cities in the 1962 Teachers College, Columbia University Conference on Curriculum and Teaching in Depressed (17) Urban Areas. Saltzman proposed that analysis in depth of neighborhood characteristics must influence the very design and construction of school buildings. The architect and the future principal are to be appointed with the decision to build, and the principal immediately takes leadership in serving as an "honest broker" between

the community and school planners. Four major urban agencies are to be brought together to participate in the planning enterprise; namely, the Board of Education, the Urban Renewal Agency, the social agencies, and the Health and Welfare agency. Pooling all their information about the area, the school finally taking shape is a center whose facilities will be ". . . available for use by social agencies, health agencies, and interested citizen groups on a seven-days-a-week; twelve-months-a-year basis." With the school as a neighborhood base of operations for many social agencies, not only teachers but the entire array of social work and health specialists come to view their shared task as one of building and maintaining an educational neighborhood.[6]

An educational theory laying down the proposition that the public school is concerned exclusively with the tools of literacy and the development of the intellectual powers is inadequate, especially as applied to elementary education in the big city. A central responsibility of the school must be to familiarize youngsters with a main stream of American culture, so that they achieve command of personal skills which will enable them to be a part of it. This way the quality of the school as a community—as a mode of human association—becomes extremely important. Big city schools need to operate as round-the-clock "community centers" or "settlement houses" to approach effectiveness in such a task.

The Educational Policies Commission Statement

The statement of policy issued by the National Education Association in 1962 entitled *Education and the Disadvantaged American*[7] is a document of considerable im-

---

[6] Henry Saltzman, "The Community School in the Urban Setting," in Harry Passow, ed., *Education in Depressed Areas* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), pp. 322-331.

[7] Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, *Education and the Disadvantaged American* (Washington, NEA, 1962).

portance for education in the Great Cities. The title is unfortunate as is the commonly used designation "culturally deprived." The problem is that of difference or distance from the standard culture. The standard culture is undoubtedly a sick one in many respects. It could well be that by some cosmic adding of lasting values and disvalues, there could be advantage in being "disadvantaged" and much profit in being deprived. Nor does the Educational Policies Commission document in text make clear the relativity of the values and the arbitrariness with which the standard culture applies its standards. Thus, the work is both pontifical and sentimental in style. Yet out of this occasionally unfortunate language there do indeed, emerge recommendations consistent with modern culture theory and of plausible practicality. The following recommendations deserve special note:

(18) 1) The school cannot avoid, and must attempt to modify the home and community environment exerting miseducative influences on children and youth. (p. 15)

2) Development of kindergarten and early childhood education under public auspices is necessary. (p. 17, p. 28)

3) Flexible organization of curricula to allow children to progress at individual rates is advisable. (p. 17)

4) Reading materials and visual aids should be adjusted to the backgrounds of children who will use them. (p. 17)

5) Opportunities for vocational training and part-time work and study should be built into school programs, and these should be given academic status of respect and dignity. (p. 18)

6) Preparation of teachers should give greater stress to the influence of environment on learning and growth; insights provided by anthropology and sociology as well as psychology and human development should be stressed. (p. 20)

7) Smaller classes must be provided (p. 21).—twenty or fewer pupils per teacher (p. 23).

8) Specialist staffs should be extended and strengthened (e.g. nurses, school social workers, guidance and clinical staff). (p. 21)

9) School administrators possessed of skills in human relations and respect for people of different cultures should be appointed. (p. 21)

10) "In many large school systems consideration should be given to developing a new type of educator—a specialist in the problems of relationships among different American subcultures. This person would attempt to relate anthropology and sociology to education. He would need intensive preparation in these three areas and practical experience in disadvantaged neighborhoods. He would help to build contacts between school and home, conduct an in-service program for all the members of the staff, and assist the staff in the solution of individual problems." (p. 22)

11) Administrative decentralization is necessary; the administration of each school should be given freedom of action. (p. 24)

12) Arrangements should be made to enroll new pupils in an ungraded reception class. (p. 27)

13) There should be complete flexibility in assigning teachers, regardless of conventional certification traditions. (p. 27)

14) Schools (including their recreational and athletic facilities) should be open late afternoons, evenings and week-ends for independent study, recreational reading, and similar activities. (p. 27)

15) Relationships between school authorities, teachers, and parents must be systematically cultivated (p. 29). One way to do this is through a lively program of adult education in the school.

16) Attention should be given to the development of fully cooperative relationships with community agencies, e.g. settlement houses, relief agencies, youth boards, (p. 30).

17) Intensive and continuing area research should be available to school personnel. (pp. 31-32)

18) Schools should remain neighborhood or area institutions. (p. 34)

ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING THE POLICIES

These policies upon which the National Education Association stood in 1962 are fundamentally sound. They rest on assumptions consistent with what we know about personality as a product of social context and meaning as wrought out (19) in community. The policies stated presuppose the following as social foundations of educational endeavor in Great Cities:

1) A public school system operates within limits. Society gives it a limited amount of time with the children, and a limited budget.

2) Within the limits of time and budget set by the society, parents in big city neighborhoods, as in other communities in our country, are willing to give school personnel considerable freedom to work as they see fit with children.

3) The objective, upon which there appears to be general agreement, is that the school should make the greatest possible contribution to the production of responsible, productive, independent adults. Some laymen would say, "School is supposed to do as much as possible to help young people stand on their own feet."

4) Children live and learn with their whole bodies, and with the neighborhoods in which they grow up. That is, a person is a biological organism, and, as well, a complex of preferences and avoidances built up out of where he has lived, the social

class in which he has grown up, and the religion in which he has been nurtured. All of that is HIM.

5) A child can be sick anywhere in his body, in his house, in his social class, in his religion. Somehow, the valuings involved in all this must be coordinated.

6) A public school is a social welfare agency. Depending on the neighborhood, school programs may be vastly different, depending on what most needs to be done.

With these assumptions in mind, and with the policy recommendations of the National Education Association at hand, the remainder of this article will be devoted to some implications of such theory for practical innovations in urban education.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE IN THE GREAT CITIES

Curricular Decentralization

City schools cannot be adapted to neighborhood differences unless a high degree of decentralization is allowed by the city school administration. On the record, decentralization is a policy of most of the Great City Boards of Education. Like all maxims, however, the actual process of individuation of school programs can be facilitated only as the people who exercise power from day to day understand, accept and work consistently to implement the policy. Teachers in most of the big city schools feel that, in actual practice, there is strong pressure from central headquarters to conform to system-wide directives.

The literature of the community school movement has been so strongly accented toward procedural considerations that curriculum organization has received inadequate attention. The argument has been that schools should be released from system-wide curricular directives and standards. Teachers in each school, it has been said, should be freed to develop the kind of program which serves the

neighborhood best. Moreover, it has been proposed that the program should emerge mainly from the agreements reached in discussion groups involving parents, community leaders, and school pupils. Parents, priests, ministers, rabbis, druggists, and business men come to the school to (20) talk with students and students take field trips to learn first-hand of the cultural, religious, political, and business life of the neighborhood.

This version of the community school, which stresses process primarily, is liable to criticism as being unscientific and anti-intellectual. Everyone admits that modern civilization is complex and that a big city is this complexity intensified to a supreme degree. An urban neighborhood is far more complex than a bridge. A good bridge could not be built by amateurs after a series of parlor conversations about "the kind of bridge we want to build." The community school idea as developed in some current educational literature is vulnerable to the same fallacy that has sometimes made laughing stock of the child-centered school. It is that precise knowledge is unimportant; that learning is a kind of free growth which pretty much takes care of itself when people are made to feel at ease with and finally to trust one another.

It is indeed good to feel at ease and to be one of a group of persons who have come genuinely to accept one another. But it is knowledge that finally gives men power so that they can gain liberty. And knowledge of a complicated organization does not come by osmosis. It comes only as symbols which carry meanings are mastered to the point where the symbols can be used precisely and effectively to relate ends and means. It comes only by study.

Undoubtedly community councils can make some contribution to good education. But charming social affairs cannot be relied upon to produce, in and of themselves, an effective school program geared to area needs. With decentralization of administrative authority and with each local board—constituted of specialists concerned with various aspects of health, education, and welfare in the area—empowered to act, curriculum variation among and within

districts becomes possible. Courses of study adjusted to local needs are constructed. Curricula peculiar to pupils in one type of school with a minimum of relationship to other school situations become customary. It becomes possible actually to put into effect the various proposals for local adaptation of curricula which some big city school leaders have long advocated.[8]

Thorough-going application of the social-cultural approach to the entire public school curriculum—i.e., through senior high school—would imply more attention to social, political, and broadly ideological stresses and strains in local neighborhoods. Serious study of the rights, duties, obligations, and opportunities of citizens of urban centers might become the core of a senior high school program built on the social foundations of education. Such a program would undoubtedly be a controversial one, for the emphasis would be on learning about and coming to take socially responsible positions with regard to the issues which need to be faced by people who live and make their livings in a big city. At present, schools in the Great Cities are not building their curricula upon these grounds. Field trips and study of local institutions are frequently used to illuminate or "enrich" the academic or vocational (21) courses of study. Intercultural social and dramatic programs are held occasionally. Adolescents are sometimes drawn in neighborhood councils. Cooperation between the informal, out-of-school teen-age programs of social agencies, religious groups, and schools are found here and there. High school drop-outs, juvenile delinquency among teen-agers, and how to meet the diverse educational needs of students in high schools receive some attention. There is a persisting concern about appropriate guidance, and at-

---

[8] For example, see New York (City) Board of Education, *Guiding Principles in Curriculum Development*, Curriculum Bulletin No. 2, 1942-43 Series (New York: City Board of Education, 1942-43), pp. 11-14. See also New York (City) Board of Education, Association of Assistant Superintendents, *Study Guide on Policies and Practices Affecting Elementary Schools* (New York: City Board of Education, 1952), p. 56.

tention is given from time to time to "intercultural education," but systematic development of instructional programs centering in social research and action are rare.

Such policy need not erode academic standards. To the contrary, the best way to bring young people to minimum standard is through individualized school programs adapted to the cultural differences among neighborhoods. To encourage such flexibility innovations such as the following are proposed:

1) A year-round school calendar with all school buildings and playgrounds open 16 hours a day. Recreational and out-door activities should make up a large part of the summer session which should be open without cost to all youngsters in the school district.
2) All course of study directions should be suggestive, not mandatory, and individual teachers and groups of teachers should be given full freedom to develop their own courses.
3) Teachers should be given unlimited access to small supplies, e.g. paper, pencils, paste, scissors, crayons.

Revision of Tests of Readiness

During the 'fifties pedagogic theory in elementary arithmetic, reading, and social studies stressed that real experiences of children in school, at home, and in the neighborhood were to furnish the starting point for learning. Not only things and arrangements in the school, but the life of streets and stores, markets, parks, rivers, harbors, bridges, public buildings, and zoos were recommended to teachers as furnishing the primary experiences out of which children should learn to build quantitative symbols and concepts.

"Natural experiences of early childhood," it was said, provide "fundamental learning situations." Things brought into the classroom (fish, plant, shell, toy, picture), the nurse, custodian, or a parent coming into the classroom, something seen on a trip (a truck, a boat, a police-

man), a holiday, a home experience, a personal experience, a gift—these were examples of what such "natural experiences" might be. Identification of things, sounds, and colors, and appropriate labelling were recommended. The sun, streets adjacent to the school, flowers, birds, gardens, mailboxes, fireboxes, something seen or heard on television or radio, the telephone directory, "interesting places in the neighborhood," the post office, were noted.

This emphasis resulted in many instances of use of environmental features of the immediate neighborhood by ingenious teachers, yet there always remained the reference to general cultural norms in evaluating progress. An example is provided in the content of a standardized test used in New York City in the 'fifties. This examination, called *The New York Reading Readiness* (22) *Test*,[9] was a line drawing-picture discrimination test. There were 148 pictures. The test was used with 5 and 6 year olds to help determine whether they were ready to learn to read. Included were the following items:

1) A tidy Cape-Cod cottage complete with shutters and lawn shrubs
2) A live duck
3) A setting hen with eggs
4) A live pig
5) A crowing rooster
6) A live turtle
7) An ascension balloon
8) A 1920 vintage glider
9) A rustic garden-gate
10) Logs

The manual of direction for teachers administering the test included the following statement:

> Among other factors of readiness for reading, children's experiential background is important and the time of testing should vary for children of vary-

[9] New York (City) Board of Education, The New York Reading *Readiness Test* (New York: City Board of Education, 1947).

ing backgrounds. In those neighborhoods where most of the children have had many rich experiences and where there is no language problem, the children are able to handle the test earlier than in neighborhoods where cultural experiences have been limited or where language difficulties are common.[10]

Yet teachers applying for appointment to jobs in New York City elementary schools in this same era were asked to write examination essays in response to questions which completely ignored the neighborhood differences. The Regular Common Branches license examination in 1949 was made up of five questions describing as many classroom situations. The situation was limited in Number I by the stipulation "a fourth year class." Number II described a "fifth year class and its teacher working on the Unit 'American Life then and Now' . . . [having] decided to take a trip to the Museum of Art to study the exhibits on New England Colonial Life." Number III specified simply "a fourth year class;" Number IV a "third year class." Part A of V specified a sixth year class, while Parts B and C of the same question were general questions about classroom techniques, with a situation not specified. Part C read, "List five other suitable experiences in democracy in the school or in the community that the teacher may use to implement her classroom activities." [11] Age, grade, and subject matter specifications were considered adequate situational determinants. Young teachers were being called upon to write critically, drawing upon their background of professional preparation. With no reference to place, social class, or ethnic factors, they were asked to write about "fourth year, fifth year, and sixth year classes."

---

[10] New York (City) Board of Education, Bureau of Reference, Research and Statistics, *Manual of Directions for the New York Reading Readiness Test Forms A and B* (New York: City Board of Education, 1947), pp. 5-61.

[11] New York (City) Board of Education, *Regular Common Branches License Examination* (mimeographed, 1949).

(23) New Textbooks Needed

Otto Klineberg as late as 1962 examined fifteen of the most widely used readers. Overwhelmingly, he discovered, the people pictured are white or Caucasian and north European in origin with names to match. Non-northern European references are highly stereotyped, e.g. an exotic treatment of American Indians, an Italian or Greek organ-grinder, and a Polish vegetable peddler.[12] The existence of such stereotypes has been known for a long time but publishers have failed to respond to the criticism, perhaps because the educators themselves have only recently begun to show real concern. For instance the early immigrants before 1880 have been presented as "pioneers" or "homesteaders," while those coming after 1880 came in "swarms," "teeming hordes," and lived in tenements. Negro slavery has been described in great detail but little attention has been given to the Negro in American culture after the Civil War.

At this writing it appears that some real progress is being made in providing textbooks of greater reality for urban children. The Follett Publishing Company and the Detroit Public Schools came out with a series of "city-oriented" elementary school readers during 1961-62 and the Bank Street College of Education began development of a similar series with Macmillan Company. Macmillan announced in 1963 that it would henceforward use pictures of Negroes and whites together whenever possible in school readers and textbooks.

Health and Guidance Services

The tremendous population density of the Great Cities creates a special need for extensive play fields and exercise areas connected with public schools. This because the important learnings which children get through free play in more sparsely settled areas are come by with difficulty in the Great Cities. And this, too, because the resistance to

---

[12] Otto Klineberg, "Life is Fun in a Smiling, Fair-Skinned World," *Saturday Review*, February 16, 1963, pp. 75-77, 87.

disease and the muscle development which free play in a sparsely settled area provides is as basic to learning as knowing the forms of letters is to writing. We might expect the Great City schools to be—in an explicitly and outstanding way—physical culture schools. A school outdoor program for each child extending, perhaps, over a three hour period each day is not too much to expect. There should be agreement on the necessity of school camps, and gradual moves by Boards of Education to acquire and equip sites. This area of need is so great in the largest cities that it should take financial priority over modernized school buildings, books, libraries, audio-visual equipment, special art and music programs. The more fundamental the need, the higher the priority if the work of the schools is to be adopted realistically to area conditions. A *reductio ad absurdum* is not intended in the suggestion that if—budget-wise—a choice has to be made between a school building and a play yard, the latter—in many areas of the city—should come first. There could be an outdoor blackboard; there could be outdoor lockers; there could be baths and toilets; there could, perhaps, be (24) some sort of rain shelters. The coldest days of winter might have to be holidays, but perhaps the time could be made up in the summer months.

Since New York, Chicago, and Newark have already established schools located within larger structures, use of roof-top space for school playgrounds, open-air classrooms and workshops, and school gardens should be considered.

Both in the Great Cities and in our school systems throughout the nation we have been willing to spend large additional amounts of money for youngsters whose difficulties are organic—for the blind, the deaf, the cerebral palsied. There would seem to be no critically grounded reason for not providing special services for children whose disabilities are environmental.

Undoubtedly firm arrangements should exist to make possible referral of severely disturbed students for psychiatric counseling. However, this does not mean that school

guidance personnel should themselves be persons who see the guidance function mainly from this perspective. The full-time professional guidance exercised by the school should be academic, vocational, and curricular. The knowledge and insight constituting the professional competence of these people should be that of the social, economic, and educational facts of life in the context in which youngsters are living. This is to support the notion that individual therapy is an adjunct educational service, not a part of the central range of educational facilities maintained by the public school.

DE FACTO SEGREGATION [1]

From

American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity.

EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMISSION of the NEA and the American Association of School Administrators. NEA Journal, October 1965.

(34) Segregation by race has been persistent in America. In some places it has been sought as public policy; in others it has been the result of housing or business practices.

The type of segregation which had the support of law, as it had in many Southern states, is today recognized as outside the law. The school-desegregation decisions of the

---

[1] The article is taken from *American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity,* which represents official NEA policy by action of the Representative Assembly. 1965. 35¢, paper cover. Stock No. 191-05972. $1.25, clothbound. Stock No. 191-05974. Order from NEA. Payment must accompany orders for $2 or less.

U. S. Supreme Court and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 have made the law on this matter clear. Much remains to be done to realize the effect of removing the legal basis of segregation, but the law at least is clear. In many areas, however, there persists a form of segregation which is produced by discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. It is not limited to any single section of the nation; as legally enforced segregation has generally been. Whites are free to move to virtually any housing they can afford. Negroes in many places do not enjoy a similar freedom but find instead whole areas closed to them. The result in many cities has been concentrations of uniform population as dense and as segregated as a medieval ghetto. It is this form of racial separation which is here referred to as *de facto* segregation.

The price of such segregation, viewed from the perspective of the general welfare of the nation, is high. When people of different cultures, classes, or races are kept apart, whether by circumstance or by design, they tend to acquire many stereotyped, exaggerated, and false impressions about each other. When the segregation is racial and based either directly or indirectly on prejudice, it also works psychological damage on all races concerned. The persons who cause the segregation through their lack of understanding or disdain for others develop an irrational sense of innate racial superiority. Members of the disdained group live constantly amid evidence that they are looked down on. If they are Negro and lack a cultural base on which to build a feeling of self-esteem amid the insults, they are pressed constantly to feel shame and resentment at inherited characteristics. They may retreat into apathy and defeatism or lash out in bitterness and hatred with much of their human potential in either case withering within them.

Thus, the damage wrought by segregation occurs at different levels. On the one hand, it denies people a good opportunity for learning to live in a multiracial and multicultural world. On the other hand, it denies people the

mental health necessary to the fullest use of their talents. In both ways, everybody suffers, and opportunities for learning and progress are less than they might have been.

In American practice, segregation is inherently unequal, for it has been based—and this is universally sensed—on a persistent and widespread prejudice against nonwhites. Today, the nonwhites are protesting. But the educational problem being inherent in the situation, long antedated the protest. The protests have dramatized the inequality and have made it impossible to maintain any longer the fiction that the conditions of the competition for success in American life are equal or fair.

The awareness that conditions are grossly unfair is a large step forward. But it does not of itself solve the problem of school segregation, and still less the rest of the problem of equal opportunity. Many parents prefer that their children go to school close to home, and this preference for a neighborhood school is frequently based on sound educational reasons and may be free of prejudice. It is, after all, more convenient to go to school near home; it saves on transportation: and the school and the home need to be in close contact. The fact that a neighborhood school may also be limited to children of one race is seen by many to be incidental. Furthermore, even parents who know that the situation is unfair may still prefer that their children not go to school with children whose cultures are widely different from their own. This phenomenon occurs even within the races. Middle-class Americans of any race usually resist having their children mix with disadvantaged (35) children of the same race. Thus it is not uncommon to find gerrymandered school attendance zones even in places where community leaders are fully aware of the corrosive effect of segregation on American ideals.

The following principles should govern the search for solutions to the problem of de facto segregation in the schools and the development of an integrated school system and an integrated society.

Segregation on grounds of race is bad. In education, it denies children, white or Negro, a chance to obtain a broader perspective on the society. It complicates the overcoming of racial stereotypes. In middle class schools, it breeds a sense of innate superiority which is unjustified and unhealthy. It causes Negroes to feel that they are being discriminated against and produces the inherently unequal circumstances of which the Supreme Court spoke in 1954.

Conversely, contacts among children of varied backgrounds are essential to education. Pupils learn much from each other. Laws or customs which enforce segregation cannot prevent contact between cultures; they merely prevent those types of contact which would do the most good. They do not insulate cultures; they only prolong incompatibility.

The best way to build good relations between the races is to enable each race to have experiences with the other which are welcome and fruitful and in which each race can come to see the other as composed of individuals and not stereotypes. Negroes who have no contact with whites—or only contacts which threaten their security—tend to develop negative attitudes toward whites in general. The school which is integrated can supply interracial experiences and offset the possible damage from their denial. By contrast the school which is racially segregated loses this capacity.

Desegregation of schools should be planned with awareness of its possible consequences and likely effects on the whole community. No two communities are identical, and each must approach the process of integration with full knowledge of local facts. There are communities, for example, where insistence on an even racial mixing in schools is more likely to produce a resegregation than an integration of schools. Care should be taken to avoid steps which will defeat the larger purposes sought through integration, and the programs of schools should be planned to increase, not decrease, the amount of integration.

The neighborhood school has many advantages, particularly in early education. It facilitates the efforts of the teacher to know the home and community, which explain so much about each pupil. The neighborhood school makes it easier also for parents to identify with and support their children's education, and it is easier to make a (36) community center of the school if it truly is a neighborhood school. However, the theoretical advantages of the neighborhood school should not be used to argue in its behalf where they are not carried into practice. Teachers in a neighborhood school may fail to profit from its advantages or may learn little about the background of their pupils. The school becomes a community center only through the conscious efforts of citizens, teachers, and administrators. If it is not or cannot become such a center, the reputed advantages of the neighborhood school disappear.

In addition, the benefits of the neighborhood school are not necessarily lost if children are transported outside the neighborhood. If a teacher has time, he can come to know homes and communities that are geographically far apart, and schools in consolidated attendance districts of vast size have succeeded in involving parents deeply in the education of their children.

The simple mixing of races in a school does not of itself solve all problems of integration. Desegregation is a physical phenomenon, but integration is a psychological phenomenon. The mere physical presence of different groups in the same building can be bad as well as good. In heterogeneous situations Negro children, if they are disadvantaged, may be unable to compete academically. White pupils may come to feel superior, and Negro pupils despised and lonely. The various groups may develop only disrespect, fear, or jealousy of each other.

Educational considerations should be primary in the schools. The questions which arise from efforts to eliminate de facto segregation deeply involve public passions pro and con, thereby complicating the search for solutions

that the public will tolerate. This search must be illuminated by the understanding that the purpose of schools is education and that no child is being served if education is being made impossible. School authorities must make clear when they believe that pupils are being used as pawns in the struggles of adults. The question to be asked about all proposals is whether they will improve the education of the pupils involved, not whether they will contribute to other goals, even desegregation.

In line with the foregoing considerations, the Educational Policies Commission recommends:

1. *Where de facto segregation exists, intensive efforts should be made to desegregate the schools.*

2. *It should be recognized that effective desegregation may be impossible for the schools to accomplish alone and that they must have the intensive support of other public and private agencies to make it possible.*

3. *Funds should be expended within a district and within a school with a view to equalizing educational opportunity, not with a view to equalizing per-pupil expenditures.* This means that more should be spent for each culturally disadvantaged pupil, just as for each physically handicapped pupil, than the average per-pupil expenditure in the school district. The greatest help should be given to the children in greatest need.

This recommendation is made despite the difficulty that would often be encountered in deciding which children should be classified as disadvantaged. For most children, the decision is likely to be cut-and-dried. Since disadvantage so often corresponds closely with extremely low income, the family income level might be used as the chief criterion.

Because it is impossible for the money to be spent on a child-by-child basis, some children will be under- or over-financed according to the criteria of this system. But the inequities would be much less than under a system in which all children are treated as if their educational needs were equal.

4. *Provision should be made in every school, preferably with pupils and parents participating in the planning, for intensive intercultural activities.* Such activities should be an important part of every school program. When children go through school and develop little sense of the way large portions of the area population live or of the contrast between American ideals and American reality, their education must be considered seriously inadequate. The schools should provide a basis in experience as well as in knowledge for combating stereotypes.

5. *Attendance district boundaries should be so established and modified as to avoid boundaries which contribute to racial separation.*

6. *Interracial experience should be provided even in places where the population of an entire school district is of one race.* This can be done, if need be, by transportation to bring pupils of different races together for certain activities. Glee club concerts, games for small children, tutoring by older pupils, or joint language clubs are examples of these activities. Art, music, and drama studios provide excellent opportunities for the development of self-respect and of mutual respect between the different races or cultures. For participants, they also motivate effort in other subjects. There is a host of other possible activities. Parent and student groups, such as PTA's and student councils, have proved ingenious in developing ideas, acting on them, and intensifying the contacts made.

Especially is it important that all-white schools in suburban areas establish relations with schools in the central cities and bring their pupils into personal contact. The suburban schools should recognize that their pupils are being deprived of experience of a part of reality if they maintain isolation and that the quality of education in the suburbs is thereby diminished. To make parents—and teachers—aware of this is an important part of school leadership.

7. *Urban renewal should involve housing and school planning in cooperation.* Many people choose to live in an

area partly on the basis of the school situation. The goal should be to create neighborhoods that will attract a mixture of racial, cultural, and economic groups. It is inexcusable for urban renewal to result in the preservation or spread of segregation, yet that has occasionally been its result. It is equally inexcusable for public housing to contribute to de facto segregation, yet that has occasionally been its result. Urban renewal and public housing should help to revivify, not to kill, the common school.

8. *Where it is impossible to put all children in a desegregated situation, that goal should still be sought for as many as possible.* Where, for example, the children of one race form a small minority of the school population, even the most complete dispersal of those children through the educational system will not produce an integrated situation. Nevertheless, even in such a situation there may still be another way to look at the problem: namely, to seek a healthy integrated situation for as many students as possible. Helping just a few more pupils to live in a multiracial world is worth considerable effort.

9. *School staffs should be racially integrated.* The principles which apply to school population apply also to school staffs. Racial separation of faculties creates the same problems as racial separation of pupils, and desegregation of school staffs offers the same advantages as desegregation of pupils. It provides pupils with examples of good relations between the races and of equal status of the races and helps to counteract or prevent stereotyping. All teachers should be selected and assigned on identical standards, irrespective of race. To effectuate this policy implies upgrading of teachers whose own educational background may be less than adequate, and the needed training should be provided at public expense.

EXTRACTS FROM BRIEF OF THE UNITED STATES FILED IN BROWN 2 (pages 12, 26 and 29).

(12) The extent of the boundary alterations required, in the reformulation of school attendance areas on a non-racial basis, will vary. This is illustrated by the recent experience in the District of Columbia in recasting attendance boundaries on a wholly geographical basis. In the neighborhoods where there is little or no mixture of the races, and where school facilities have been fully utilized, it was found that the elimination of the racial factor did not work any material change in the territory served by each school. In biracial neighborhoods, however, the objective of securing maximum utilization of facilities, on a non-racial basis, could be achieved only by making radical revisions in the area covered by the formerly Negro and white schools.

(26) If the program for desegregation formulated by the defendants will remove, as expeditiously as possible, state-imposed or state-supported racial classifications of pupils in public schools, the lower courts should not substitute their judgment respecting the administrative features of the program for that of the school authorities. The Constitution prohibits the maintenance of segregated school systems. It does not compel the adoption of any specific type of nonsegregated system. The decisive inquiry is whether race or color has been entirely eliminated as a criterion in the admission of pupils to public schools. The essence of the Court's decision in these cases is that there be no governmental action which enforces or supports school segregation.

(29) School authorities may wish to give pupils a choice of attending one of several schools, a choice now prohibited. Teachers may have to be transferred, and teaching schedules rearranged. It is possible, of course, that abolition of segregation would in many areas produce no serious dislocations, and no wholesale transfers of teachers or pupils would be required. This could result from purely geographical factors, for it would still be likely that the pupils of a school would be representative of the area in which it is situated.

EXTRACT FROM BRIEF OF CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION FILED BY HON. ARTHUR GOLDBERG IN BROWN 2 (pages 7 and 8).

* * *. Such broader considerations, of course, need not be stated by the Court. But they are nevertheless relevant in the Court's decision as to whether it will take the immediate step before it.

Three considerations seem to us worthy of discussion. The first is the general question of the doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson* and the arguments which we believe have been erroneously addressed to the holding of that case. The second is the extent to which the compulsory nature of primary school education should be regarded as differentiating it from the cases of higher education already decided by the courts. Finally, we think that a word should be said concerning the "racial friction and tension" [1] which have been relied upon by some courts to justify their refusal to determine whether segregated education is, in fact, equal education.

1. *Compulsory intermingling is not the only alternative to compulsory segregation.* Much of the argument relating to the basic question of the validity of racial segregation under the 14th Amendment has, we believe, missed the point. For example, in the *Briggs* case, No. 101, this Term, it seems to have been assumed by the defendants that the only alternative to compulsory segregation is compulsory intermingling of the races. Testimony was offered by the defendants in that case to the effect that separation of the races in the public schools would occur even "if this issue should be settled on a voluntary basis" because if Negroes were given a choice as to whether to attend Negro schools or schools which were predominantly white, they would prefer to attend schools of their own race.[2]

Argument based upon such testimony seems to us to

---

[1] *Briggs v. Elliott*, No. 101, this Term, R. 180.

[2] "Q. Do you know what the Negro's reaction would be to mixed schools?

. . . .

(Continued on following page)

miss the very point at issue. The essence of the whole segregation controversy lies in the distinction between a provision of law *permitting* individuals to separate themselves according to race and a provision *requiring* them so to separate. As we pointed out in the *Sweatt* and *McLaurin* cases, it is this important distinction which the Court itself ignored in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. A law permitting individuals to separate themselves according to race permits individuals to exercise their own freedom of choice, to respond in whatever way their prejudices or lack of prejudices may impel them. To require individuals so to separate permits no such choice. Prejudice is imposed by the constituted authority of the state without regard to the preferences of the individual. Yet this Court in the *Plessy* case treated the two together and assumed that they were the same. Thus the Court said that "we cannot say that a law which authorizes or even requires the separation of the two races in public conveyance" is violative of the 14th Amendment. 163 U. S. at 550. And the argument against the statute, the Court said, "assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation, and that equal rights cannot be secured to the Negro except by an enforced commingling of the two races." 163 U. S. at 551.

The argument, of course, need make no such assumption. The alternatives are not enforced segregation or enforced commingling. Nor is the question whether a law may constitutionally *permit* the separation of the races. The alternative to enforced segregation is freedom of choice and the question is whether a state may deny that freedom to individuals and require them, willy-nilly, to separate according to race.

(Continued from preceding page)

A. I could not predict what they would do but I have an opinion that is based upon what a number of Negro school administrators have said to me, that if this issue should be settled on a voluntary basis that you would have a continuance of substantially the same situation.

. . .

A good many Negroes, Negro school administrators have said that if they remain free to choose the schools to which they would go, they would prefer to have schools of their own race."

—*Briggs v. Elliott*, No. 101, this Term, R. 116-117.

EXTRACT FROM BRIEF OF AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE FILED IN BROWN 2 (pages 5 and 6).

Question 4(a) seems to imply that a decree ordering admission of Negro children into schools heretofore attended solely by white children must necessarily refer to normal geographic school districting and/or to admission of the children into "schools of their choice."

The administration of public school systems is not, and need not by this Court be, thus limited. These cases do not involve modes of administering the public schools, except at one point: that the governmental authorities make no racial distinctions between children in the operation of the public school system.

The easiest way to operate a normal public school system without racial distinctions is by assigning children to schools according to their residence within normal geographic school zones. It is a factual, impersonal, and traditional criterion in administering public schools. It tends to reflect the normal neighborhood pattern, it permits easier programming of school and community needs, and it avoids the imbalance between schools which results from unrestrained migration of pupils. Nevertheless, we do not contend that the Constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the laws requires that boards of education be compelled to admit children into schools solely on geographic bases, or that the boards be compelled to permit, or be enjoined from permitting, each child to "choose" which of several public schools he will attend. *Cf. Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U. S. 510 (1925); *Farrington v. Tokushige*, 273 U. S. 284, 298 (1927). These are matters of public school administration which are committed to the sound judgment of school officials; they are not matters to be regulated by judicial decree.

EXTRACTS FROM ORAL ARGUMENT, CASES 1-5, OCTOBER TERM, 1954, VOL. 3, APRIL 11-14, 1955.

(23) Mr. Fatzer: That is Item No. 4, "The following is the estimate of the number of students in 1955-56 that would be in the affected schools."

Justice Reed: Does that mean Negroes, too?

Mr. Fatzer: Yes.

Justice Reed: You don't know the percentage of Negro students in each school?

Mr. Fatzer: No, I am in error, your Honor. That is total enrollment.

Justice Reed: I understood you had a total enrollment of some 8,000?

Mr. Fatzer: Yes, that is correct.

Justice Reed: Then there is only 2750 accounted for here.

Mr. Fatzer: We would be glad, your Honor, to provide this breakdown with respect to these schools, with respect to whether they are white or colored in each grade.

Justice Reed: It would help me.

Mr. Fatzer: All right. In other words—

Justice Reed: You have redistricted and what I was interested in is to know whether the redistricting has resulted in essential—whether all the school population will be unsegregated, or whether you will have all of the schools in one section all colored population.

(24) Mr. Fatzer: The colored schools are in the areas that are predominantly through history, geographic residential colored areas.

Justice Reed: Very normal that there is a separation of population.

Mr. Fatzer: Now on the fringe, some of the colored students under this plan would go to the white schools, the white children that are in the new areas, new districts, could likewise complete their course. They can attend either school. It is a privilege that is given to either child.

Justice Reed: And we do not know how long that will continue, strictly speaking?

Mr. Fatzer: Well, from now on. I mean, segregation.

Justice Reed: The plan could result in not a segregated school, but an all-white school and an all-Negro school?

Mr. Fatzer: It is my understanding, sir, that that would not be the case. Now for the children, if you will note under No. 2-D, any child who is affected by the change in district lines as herein recommended, be given the option of finishing elementary grades. That would be, if he was in the first grade, he could finish the elementary grades 1 to 6 in the school which he attended this current year. Now that is equally available to both the colored and the white students.

Justice Reed: I understand that, but it is also (25) equally available that all the Negroes could go to one school and all the whites to another.

Mr. Fatzer: I am not prepared to say on that, sir, but my understanding is that that would not be the case. We will be glad to furnish the Court maps showing this area and we would be glad to show a breakdown under No. 4, Mr. Justice Reed, of the per cent and the number of the different white and colored students.

Justice Frankfurter: I would be grateful to you if you would add to that what is not fully clear in my mind and I do not want to take the Court's and your time—if you would be good enough to state why there had to be, in the judgment of the School Board, redistricting and the basis on which the redistricting was done.

Is my question clear?

Mr. Fatzer: Why redistricting—

Justice Frankfurter: Why was it necessary, in order to carry out the desegregation, the abolition of segregation, why was it necessary to have new or changed school districts and what were the considerations which led to the kind of districts that they carried out?

Mr. Fatzer: It is my understanding, Mr. Justice, that the reasons they required the redistricting of the schools, as this proposal would establish, is that colored schools did not have a district previously, that is, (26) in a general

large way, that children living in this particular part of the city would attend this particular school.

Justice Frankfurter: They just took them by bus to schools set aside for colored children?

Mr. Fatzer: That is right.

Justice Frankfurter: I see.

Mr. Fatzer: They gathered them up. So that now they have definite proposed districts for each of these schools with definite geographic lines.

Justice Frankfurter: And your maps will show the nature of the districts, the contours of the districts, will they not?

Mr. Fatzer: That is correct. Thank you, your Honors, very much.

The Chief Justice: Mr. Carter?

ORAL ARGUMENT ON BEHALF OF BROWN, ET AL.

By Mr. Robert L. Carter.

Mr. Carter: We are in accord with Mr. Fatzer that the case should be reversed and remanded to the District Court. We feel that the decree should be entered by this court declaring the Kansas statute by which power the Topeka Board proceeded to organize and have segregated schools, that that statute be declared unconstitutional and void.

* * * * *

(31) Mr. Carter: Yes, sir. There are five who are in the junior high school who have moved out of this class because they are not in a non-segregated school. About six of them are attending Washington, Buchanan, and Monroe schools which are the segregated schools.

Justice Harlan: Is that the result of compulsion, or their own choice?

Mr. Carter: Well, your Honor, as a result of expulsion, this plan, what is known as the third step—there were 18 school districts in Topeka. The first six schools listed on page 2 of the Order, the papers which the At-

torney General gave you, those schools are the remaining six schools in which segregation still obtains, the all-white schools. The lower four schools are the all-Negro schools.

In all of the other districts, that is approximately 12, Negro and white children are attending schools together, that is the Negro children are able to go to the schools that are nearest to their homes.

This third step purports to complete the integration of the system and to bring into the system the three Negro schools and make it a part of the total school system. Now instead of 18 schools, you will have 21 schools purportedly servicing every one. Our objection to this is the fact that in our opinion these three schools will remain segregated, all Negro children will be attending them for many years to come and (32) we think that does not conform to your Order.

Justice Douglas: Are those Buchanan, Monroe and Washington?

Mr. Carter: Yes, sir.

Justice Clark: Will that be on a voluntary basis, you think?

Mr. Carter: No, that will not be on a voluntary basis because the Negro children who now live in the District, as this thing is reorganized in the district serviced, for example, by Buchanan, as you will note, the children in this district have an option to go to a school outside of the District, but since the Negro children only had the option or the right before this thing was put into effect, to go to Buchanan, Monroe and Washington, they can not exercise an option to go to any other school than the Negro school. That means this, that the white children will go out of the district and continue to go to the schools they are going to and the Negro children will be forced to continue in Buchanan, therefore you will have segregated schools.

I think that is as much segregation as before the May 17th Order.

Justice Harlan: Do you attribute that result to the way the option system may work rather than the way the district is made up?

Mr. Carter: Yes, sir, I know nothing about the (33) district. I cannot say whether the districting is done fairly. I do not know anything about the matter. But on the face of it, this is my objection to the plan as it is given to us by the Attorney General.

Justice Clark: I thought all the students would be given a choice as to whether they want to stay there or go to another school under Section 3, page 1, the bottom of the page. It does not say all, but it says the estimated number of students who will transfer is indicated as one-third.

Mr. Carter: I know, Justice Clark, but if you will look on page 1, Item D on the third step, this is the option, that "Any child who is affected by change in the district lines as herein recommended, be given the option of finishing elementary grades in the school which he attended 1954-55 and continue therein."

This is the option to be exercised and this is the option where the Negro child has no option and the white child in the District that is serviced by one of the former Negro schools, has an option to go out of the district and the Negro child has not.

The Chief Justice: Thank you, Mr. Carter.

* * * * *

(35) Justice Reed: From what you say, I take it that you consider it proper to allow an option to a child to go to another school, that is within the limits of the Constitution?

Mr. Fatzer: Bearing in mind, sir, that our understanding at present—

Justice Reed: Before you answer that, may I make another statement. I understand that normally a child in Topeka goes to the school in the school district in which he resides?

Mr. Fatzer: Yes, sir.

Justice Reed: Now, there is a variation from that which allows him to go to another school if he has been going there before. That is the 2-E section?

Mr. Fatzer: Yes. He can complete his elementary course in the other school, if he should be in another district.

Justice Reed: A child who goes to school for the first time, for the first year, in the first grade, may he choose a school to which he goes?

Mr. Fatzer: The first year only.

Justice Reed: And after having chosen the first year, then he continues there?

Mr. Fatzer: He must attend in the district in which he resides under plan 2-E.

Justice Reed: If he attends in 1955-56, you interpret that to mean only for 1955-56, for that year?

* * * * *

(56) * * * The Board of Education, however, called upon the Superintendent to have that map by the first of July, and in spite of the fact that there had been suggestions of administrative reasons that would make that impossible by the first of July, this zoning map was produced. We call attention to that because, as I have indicated to you, we think it will be helpful, that sometimes when the Administrators in candor and in honesty think that something can not be done, that if there be an affirmative action taken, that ways are found to meet that situation, and that was done in the instant case.

Mr. Corning did furnish the zoning maps. Now, I have heard the question asked as I have sat here this morning, as to the reason why the zoning maps were necessary. In our jurisdiction they would be necessary because, prior to the time of the decision of May 17, there were schools designated for Negroes and schools designated for whites, and persons within the respective areas would go to the designated schools because of that circumstance. And when this Court, by its decision of May 17, struck down the segregated setup, it became necessary to have zones having to do simply with the geographic situation, rather than being based on the question of race or color. And that was undertaken. That is what was done by the first

of July. And then with those zones set up, Mr. Corning, as the Superintendent, presented to the Board a plan (57) which, by various steps, would be carried forward until, according to the plan, in September of 1955, the school system was to be completely integrated.

I call your Honors' attention to the fact at the outset that there would be no need for anything beyond a decree saying what the Board of Education has indicated, what the Superintendent has set forth as a plan is to be envisioned for our schools as of September, 1955. That, according to the plan, is to be a complete integration. If that were all, we would ask nothing other at the hands of this Court, than a decree which would set forth that there should no longer be an administering of the school system in the District of Columbia where the question of race or color was in any sense involved, as a part of any administrative action, as a part of any attendance as far as school children were concerned, as far as teachers were concerned.

And be it said to the credit of the Board of Education in this jurisdiction, they have gone forward in the doing of all of that. They have gone forward in the matter of integration both as to pupils, and as to teachers and as to administrative officers.

However, we have concern, because as far as some of the plan, it lends itself as we see it, to the possibility of error. Even though, as has been indicated, the provision is that students—if I have not indicated to your Honors that this (58) is fundamental in it. I should perhaps first say that. That the suggestion is that students under the new zoning will have the right to go to schools of their choice within this area.

In other words, if I be in a given area, school area, I have the preferential right to go to that school that is in that area. But it allows the option of remaining at school until graduation is had if the individual desires to do so.

In other words, as we conceive it, a geographic school district which in, and of itself, would lay the proper foundation for the integrated schools is superimposed on a

right that may be exercised by a student, the result of which is, as we see it, that race is still made the issue, and the question of the segregation is carried forward just as before, because by the exercise of this option, a child may continue to stay in the school until the time of his graduation.

Justice Reed: Is there more than one grade school in a school district?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, your Honor.

Justice Reed: They have several in a single district?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, your Honor, or there will be a number of elementary schools within each school district.

(59) There would probably be not as many junior high schools but I venture to say there are some in which the district takes over one junior high school. If I be incorrect as to that, as I say that may not be. But the districting has to do with the question of the elementary school area, the junior high school area, the high school area.

Justice Reed: That is unusual in my thinking.

I was not aware that there was more than one elementary school in a district.

Mr. Hayes: I am certain, if your Honor please, that that is correct.

Justice Reed: In that district any white child or Negro child can select his own school?

Mr. Hayes: He goes to the school nearest to him in his own area.

Justice Reed: It is measured by feet or something?

Mr. Hayes: I do not think there are instances very often where there would be a question—

Justice Reed: It would be easy enough if you have one school in a district. If you had only one school, everybody closer to that school than any other, he would go then to that school?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, it is my understanding as I say, that a number of schools may be within a district.

Justice Reed: That was true before with segregation.

(60) Mr. Hayes: I beg your pardon.

Justice Reed: That was true when you had segregation, you had overlapping district?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, sir. Well, now, with the present school districting there will be schools still as I conceive it in so far as the elementary schools are concerned as your Honor will see—in the junior high schools and it may well be that that is not true then, but I am relatively certain and as I say, my friends can give you the statistics actually with respect to that that there will be elementary schools, there may be other elementary schools in the same district but he goes to the one that is nearest to him.

Justice Reed: Is that in the statement?

Mr. Hayes: Well, there is nothing in the statement, if your Honor please, that breaks it down into whether one—

Justice Reed: Do you have a regulation? How do you know that the child is to go to the nearest school in the District?

Mr. Hayes: The only way I can say that to you, sir, is that that is a part of what I understand the Corning plan to be. The Corning plan would provide that the child shall go to the school nearest to him in his district.

Justice Burton: Mr. Hayes, you referred to the (61) right of a child to stay in a given school until his graduation from that school. I take it that this is merely a temporary measure, is it not, that has to do with the status at the moment and it will work out over a period of two or three years? That is not to break up the continuity of the course?

Mr. Hayes: It would presumably work out at the end of the graduation period through the intermediate grade from the time the child graduated from that to the junior high school, that would end his right to exercise his option.

Justice Burton: If so, the child last year, if he was in junior high school, he could complete his junior high school course without breaking into it and being forced to go somewhere else?

Mr. Hayes: That is what I understand the plan to suggest and the plan purports to suggest that immediately

you go into the new area, in other words, when you go from the intermediate to the junior, when you go from the junior to senior high school, you have the right to stay until graduation is over.

Justice Burton: You are talking about matters of continuity for the child in a given school?

Mr. Hayes: That is what is urged as being the reason for the thing. I suggest, that it is the question of continuity within the graduation of a child in a (62) particular school.

Justice Minton: You do not contend that it is done for any purpose of discrimination?

Mr. Hayes: No, the actual language, if your Honor please, would not result in discrimination. We are concerned as to whether or not the administering of it might not be distorted, and not in any sense saying that the present administration has done any such distorting. I am in no position to say that and would not say that. But we are concerned that the language of a decree which we are asking would be of such character as would render impossible the use of that device as a means of discrimination.

Justice Black: How would this be done?

Mr. Hayes: By leaving this option—

Justice Black: I mean how could the plan which you have just outlined that they are suggesting be used for discrimination?

Mr. Hayes: Well, this type of thing could occur as we see it, that a child who had a right to go to a particular school by reason of the geographic area might not be allowed to go to that school because in that school there was a child who exercised the preferential right to stay there until graduation.

Justice Black: I thought the plan provided that they were given a choice, some were given a choice and others had (63) to go to specific schools.

Mr. Hayes: If your Honor pleases, what the option is that is allowed is that, if I am in school "A," I can remain in school "A" until graduation unless—

Justice Black: You do not object to that, do you?

Mr. Hayes: Well, when your Honor says we do not object, we object to it simply because of the fact that we feel that the allowance of that is still the carrying forward of the old idea of the segregated setup, because the setup, because the right to remain in that school was basically one of color.

In other words, the person went into that school because of this segregated setup.

Justice Black: You mean you want a decree that will prevent an option being given to children where there are two or three schools to go to, to permit them to go to that one school?

Mr. Hayes: No, we do not think that the decree from this Court should do any forbidding. We think rather, that the decree from this Court should simply indicate that there should be nothing done where color was used as a criteria. Now we feel that this is a possibility and is a perpetuating of the old idea of color being the criterion.

Justice Black: Is it your idea that because there is a possibility that there should be no option left to the children of either race to select their own schools?

(64) Mr. Hayes: No, we think rather, if the decree were to take the shape which I have suggested to your Honor, that then in the event that there were showings, flagrant showings of a violation of this right of option, that then there would be the right to go to the Courts without the establishing of a principle that we feel has already now been established.

Justice Black: I have not quite made my question clear. Can that come from mere option of the child to choose one school rather than another?

Mr. Hayes: Well, we feel—

Justice Black: Would you object to that under any circumstance? Do you believe the parents of the child or the child would be left free to select one of the schools? I ask you that because I know that has been the rule all over the country where they have two or three schools.

Mr. Hayes: Well, if your Honor please, as we conceive it, as I have said to your Honor, in fairness so far as the District of Columbia is concerned, I do not find too much to give me concern. But I would be concerned since we have adjusted ourselves to other decrees, about a decree that left an option to the individual, himself, because, if that option were left, it seems to me that the very force of the decree might be obviated by that sort of a device.

(65) Justice Black: Would you go then far enough to say that this Court should provide that the law is compelled to deny option of children to go to one school rather than another?

Mr. Hayes: No, I have said, your Honor, there should not be any such denial. I do not think this Court should undertake to say that. I think, rather, that a decree of the character which we have in mind would not require that at all. It would not estop the questions of options properly exercised, but may, as I say, give rise to the possibility of overcoming what might then become a flagrant violation.

Justice Black: You mean that coercion instead of option, freedom of choice, you would want that prevented?

Mr. Hayes: A number of things of that character might come in and might come in under the heading of "Option." And that is the reason I believe that I should bring these things up.

Justice Reed: Let me pursue that point.

Mr. Hayes: Yes, Mr. Justice.

Justice Reed: I am surprised to find there are two or more schools in a district in the District of Columbia, but let us assume that there are two schools. One of them used to be a Negro school and the other white. Now then you have an objection to allowing the students to choose which one they (66) go to?

Mr. Hayes: Mr. Korman has stated to me that what happened was only true in two instances where they were so close together that they could not draw two circles.

That may answer what was in your Honor's mind and may correct what is in my mind except for these two exceptions.

Justice Reed: Let us take those two exceptions. Do you object to a choice of schools in that one area or two areas when there are two in the same district?

Mr. Hayes: No, it is not that.

Justice Reed: The ultimate result would be one of them could be all Negro, the other could be all white?

Mr. Hayes: Well, with a small overlapping to which Mr. Korman makes reference, in a city such as ours, I do not believe that that would come as a possibility. It might be but I do not think by any type of gerrymandering or anything else, there could be any such situation that would end up with there being simply a white as against a colored school. Now there may be areas from a geographic districting which might end up in what your Honor says with respect to all white and all colored. That might be.

Justice Reed: Concerning Justice Black's questions, you have no objection constitutionally to the selection in the District by children?

(67) Mr. Hayes: Well, when your Honor says it in that wise, I have a concern that I did not gather just what Justice Black's question was.

We do not think that this Court should say by its mandate that no one shall have the right to exercise an option. We do not think that that would be right.

Justice Reed: We do not say that. We say that they can exercise an option.

Mr. Hayes: No. If your Honor please, if your Honors would confine the decree to the language and character which we think ought to be, then we feel that abuse of the option period would fall within the purview of such a decree. And, as Mr. Justice Black has indicated, at some time further along the line, somebody says, "Oh, I am going to exercise my option," if you could go in and say this wasn't an exercise of option, if it was coercion or anything else, that is what we would be concerned with. May I call your Honor's attention to an example of something which has happened in our school system which gives us concern as to the actual putting into effect of the regulations as provided?

I just answered a question by saying that when you graduate from one level to another, that the person who goes into this new level, presumably then comes under this geographic condition. He does not have any right now to claim promotions or anything of that character. We had the (68) situation develop that there were, according to what we are advised, a graduation in which there were 1,018 junior high graduates entering the high schools, according to new non-racial boundaries. Of the students promoted, 571 came from schools of the old Negro division and 525 came from formerly white schools.

122 of the students from former all Negro schools were promoted to six former all-white high schools. One Negro boy moved from an integrated former white junior high into vocational high which had retained its Negro enrollment.

No white students were promoted to former Negro schools. Now, we call attention to that sort of circumstance, that it would be a rather unusual thing with the zoning change as has been indicated, zoning now without regard to color, new zoning with overlapping districts where, in one instance, there were certain Negro areas that now the new zone which is the unsegregated situation goes deep into that area, it seems to us a rather unusual circumstance that under those conditions 120-some Negroes would go, be graduated into a new area, to a white high school, and that there would be no whites, who, having been promoted, would go to a Negro school. It is the type of administering of that kind that gives us the concern.

Justice Frankfurter: May I ask you to what issue more readily you are addressing yourself? Is it to the kind of (69) decree this Court should fashion in directly greater detail than fashioned by the District Court or which?

Mr. Hayes: If your Honor please, just what I have in mind is the type of decree that this Court should pass in remanding the case to the District Court.

Justice Frankfurter: Do you think this court can go into particularities?

Mr. Hayes: No, sir.

Justice Frankfurter: As to what would or would not operate not as a fair opportunity for a fair choice but some kind of a "huggamugga," some kind of a manipulation whereby what is deemed to be a fair choice is not really a fair choice.

Do you think we could particularize that?

Mr. Hayes: No, I do not ~~think~~ you can. If your Honors please, we have attempted to draft what we think would cover the situation having to do with the question of the nonsegregated setup and that the defendants and agents and the like should be estopped from using race as a criteria.

Justice Frankfurter: Have you in your brief set forth a proposal for the kind of decree that you would like this Court to issue?

Mr. Hayes: No, your Honor, we have not.

Justice Frankfurter: Would that appeal to you or would it be agreeable to you?

* * * * *

(80) * * * They do not want to pay minimum wages, they do not want to pay this, they do not want to have that; but the law is there; they keep the attitude but they obey the law.

The same thing with income tax. Everybody is worrying now for a few days that they are going to have to pay income tax. Very few people are running around happy over it. The attitude is not good but all of them pay it. And therefore, I say, it seems to me that in this area a firm decision calling forthwith integration will be accepted and will be complied with by the South where I have lived all of my life and that thus, in spite of all their protestations and the attitude which many of them generally genuinely have, they will follow a decision of this Court just as other Americans follow the law.

Justice Reed: Mr. Nabrit, before you sit down I do not understand this language of your proposed decree, giving a choice. I have asked questions about it before.

Are you familiar with the problems of choice that came up?

Mr. Nabrit: Yes, I am and I would like to address myself for a moment if I may, to that. In the District of Columbia there is a system of administration and operation of the school which is known as the Districting Plan. Now there are different plans educationally in the United States (81) that you are familiar with. In some places, there are no districts. You just go to whatever school you want to until that school is full, and then you find another one and go to that. Baltimore has a system something like that.

In other schools they have the boundary system, the districting, and you go to the school in your district except as—and all of them have this which relates to Mr. Justice Black's question—all of them have some ground upon which they will excuse you from going to a particular school. There are many grounds of hardships, where they will do that, in the sibling case and others. In the District of Columbia, however, we have this system based upon districting. That is the basis on which the school board says children shall be assigned, and they voted a policy that it would be done, and only the hardship or necessary situation of overriding necessity would permit any departure from that.

Now that was the policy.

Justice Reed: The Board policy?

Mr. Nabrit: Yes. Now when the plan was proposed which the Board adopted, there was a difference between the policies and this plan, and it is that difference to which we call the Court's attention, that is, that in this plan which provided for this forthright imposition of the boundary or district system, there was set up inside the system, a system which provided that all of the pupils in all of the schools could (82) stay right where they were until they graduated, unless—and you should know this because this even weakens the position still further, we want you to know that—unless your remaining there prevented a student who lived in that district from getting into it.

So that takes some more of the sting out of it. But we consider that bad because, looking at the Labor Relations cases and others, where this Court has said where you have a choice regarding a union or not, here is a company union, here is another union, that the choice is not a choice. You do not have freedom of choice. And where you come out of a segregated system where everybody in the system is segregated and you say to the Negro child, sure, you have a choice and to the white child, you have got a choice, I mean that is not choice. So that we simply point it out because it goes for five years and there is nothing that we have found that indicates that at the end of the fourth year the Board would adopt another plan with that in there.

Justice Reed: That is in it—

Mr. Nabrit: I think it is on page 10 of our brief, Mr. Justice Reed. It is on page 10, No. 3 in the next to the bottom paragraph, "All pupils at present enrolled in a given school may remain until graduation provided the school is not overcrowded and provided the priority rights of pupils within the new boundaries of the school are not denied."

(83) Justice Reed: There is another angle to that same choice. In your own decree, you provided a choice.

Mr. Nabrit: Now in ours, we said, we do not deny any child the right to go to the school of his choice on the grounds of race or color within the normal limits of your districting system.

In other words, you have this districting system here. Now, we say in that system, let children go to the schools of their choice within that system.

Justice Reed: Within that district.

Mr. Nabrit: That is right.

And do not assign them on the basis of race or color, and we have no complaint. If you have some other basis, all boys, all girls, 16 or 14, any other basis, we have no objection. But just do not put in race or color as a factor. And on that basis, we do not complain. But I do not think that it will be found to help the Court very much to try

to look at a system where nothing existed by choice, and contrast it with the districting system in which there is this type of choice.

The Chief Justice: Thank you, Mr. Nabrit.

* * * * *

(126) * * * We took the position that in any decree issued that says "forthwith," that normal administrative details always come into consideration, so as far as we are concerned, if the decree says "September of 1955," that will be exactly what we want.

Justice Frankfurter: I am sure you will agree in this kind of litigation, it is of the utmost importance to use language of fastidious accuracy?

Mr. Marshall: Absolutely; we agree with you fully. That is why we would rather have it say September of 1955.

The other specific point is that we believe that the Appellants in these cases, those of high school age from Prince Edward County and those of elementary and high school age of District 1 which includes Clarendon County, should be admitted as of September, 1955, and the entire class that they represent.

Justice Harlan: Mr. Marshall, on page 29 of your joint brief—

Mr. Marshall: Yes, sir.

Justice Harlan: —as I read it, you suggest as an alternative date, September 1, 1956.

Mr. Marshall: Yes, sir.

Justice Harlan: You indicate that that would be acceptable?

* * * * *

REVISED STATEMENT OF POLICIES FOR SCHOOL DESEGREGATION PLANS UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

December 1966

As Amended for the School Year 1967-68

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Office of Education

* * * * *

SUBPART A—APPLICABILITY OF THIS STATEMENT OF POLICIES

§ 181.1 *Title VI and the HEW Regulation*

Section 601 of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides that:

> No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

As required by Section 602 of Title VI, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued a Regulation to assure the elimination of discrimination in Federal aid programs it administers. The HEW Regulation was published as Part 80 of Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR Part 80).

§ 181.2 *Compliance by School Systems Eliminating Dual School Structure*

To be eligible for Federal aid, a school system must act to eliminate any practices in violation of Title VI, including the continued maintenance of a dual structure of separate schools for students of different races. The HEW Regulation recognizes two methods of meeting this requirement: (1) a desegregation order of a Federal court; or (2) a voluntary desegregation plan.

§ 181.3 *Purpose of This Statement of Policies*

This Statement of Policies applies to public elementary and secondary school systems undergoing desegregation to eliminate a dual school structure. It sets forth the requirements which voluntary desegregation plans must meet for the Commissioner to determine under the HEW Regulation that a plan is adequate to accomplish the purposes of Title VI. This Statement supersedes the "General Statement of Policies Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 Respecting Desegregation of Elementary and Secondary Schools," issued in April 1965 and published as 45 CFR Part 181, and has been amended further to make it applicable to the school year 1967-68.

§ 181.4 *Initial Demonstration of Compliance*

To be eligible for Federal aid, a school system must first assure the Commissioner that it will comply with Title VI and the HEW Regulation. It must submit the form of assurance that meets its circumstances, under §§ 181.5, 181.6, or 181.7 below.

§ 181.5 *Systems Without Dual School Structure*

(a) *Submission of Form 441.* A school system which does not maintain any characteristic of a dual school structure may initially demonstrate compliance by submitting HEW Form 441. This is an assurance of full and immediate compliance with Title VI.

(b) *Resubmission Not Required.* A school system which has appropriately submitted HEW Form 441 need not submit a new copy with subsequent requests for Federal aid, but need only affirm when requested that the assurance submitted continues in effect.

(c) *Supplementation of Assurance.* The Commissioner may require supplementation of HEW Form 441 when he has reasonable cause to believe that there is a failure to comply with any provision of Title VI or the HEW Regulation.

§ 181.6 *Systems Under Federal Court Order for Desegregation*

(a) *Submission of Order.* A school system under a Federal court desegregation order which meets the requirements of the HEW Regulation may submit, as evidence of compliance with Title VI, a copy of the court order, together with an assurance that it will comply with the order, including any future modification.

(b) *Resubmission Not Required.* A school system under a court order accepted by the Commissioner need not submit another copy, but must submit any modification not previously submitted.

(c) *Revision of Court Orders.* A school system under a court order for desegregation which is not in accord with current judicial standards is subject to legal action by the Department of Justice, or by the parties to the original suit, to modify the order to meet current standards.

§ 181.7 *Systems With Voluntary Desegregation Plans*

(a) *Submission of Form 441-B.* A school system with a voluntary desegregation plan must provide an assurance that it will abide by the applicable requirements for such plans contained in this Statement of Policies. Such assurance may be given by submitting HEW Form 441-B to the Commissioner. Commitments of funds for new activities are subject to deferral, as provided by law, for school systems with voluntary desegregation plans which have failed to submit HEW Form 441-B.

(b) *Resubmission Not Required.* A school system which has appropriately submitted HEW Form 441-B need not submit a new copy with subsequent requests for Federal aid, but need only affirm when requested that the assurance submitted continues in effect.

(c) *Changing Type of Plan.* A school system may change from one type of desegregation plan to another if such action would eliminate segregation and all other forms of discrimination more expeditiously. A school system planning to change the type of its plan must submit a

new plan meeting the requirements of this Statement of Policies, together with HEW Form 441-B, for a determination by the Commissioner as to the adequacy of the plan to accomplish the purposes of Title VI.

(d) *Retaining Present Type of Plan.* A school system with a desegregation plan accepted by the Commissioner need not resubmit its plan if it intends to continue under the same type of plan. If a plan accepted by the Commissioner fails to meet any requirement under this Statement of Policies, the submission of HEW Form 441-B will be deemed to amend the plan so that it will meet such requirement. Amendments to the plan are not to be submitted unless requested. However, certain supporting materials must be submitted, as provided in Subparts B, C, and D below.

(e) *Initial Submittal of Plans.* If no desegregation plan has been submitted or accepted for a school system, HEW Form 441-B and a plan meeting the requirements of this Statement of Policies must be submitted.

[§§ 181.8 through 181.10 reserved]

SUBPART B—BASIC REQUIREMENTS FOR ALL VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION PLANS

§ 181.11 *Various Types of Desegregation Plans*

It is the responsibility of a school system to adopt and implement a desegregation plan which will eliminate the dual school system and all other forms of discrimination as expeditiously as possible. No single type of plan is appropriate for all school systems. In some cases, the most expeditious means of desegregation is to close the schools originally established for students of one race, particularly where they are small and inadequate, and to assign all the students and teachers to desegregated schools. Another appropriate method is to reorganize the grade structure of schools originally established for students of different races so that these schools are fully utilized, on a desegregated basis, although each school contains fewer grades. In some cases desegregation is accomplished by the estab-

lishment of non-racial attendance zones. Under certain conditions, a plan based on free choice of schools may be a way to undertake desegregation. In certain cases the purposes of Title VI may be most expeditiously accomplished by a plan applying two or more of the foregoing procedures to certain schools or different grade levels. Based on consideration of all the circumstances of a particular school system, the Commissioner may determine that its desegregation plan is not adequate to accomplish the purposes of Title VI, in which case he may require the adoption of an alternative plan. In any case where the State education agency is pursuing policies and programs for expediting the elimination of the dual school structure, the Commissioner will consider this factor in determining whether a particular type of plan is adequate for any given school system in such State.

§ 181.12 *Student Assignment Practices*

Title VI precludes a school system from any action or inaction designed to perpetuate or promote segregation or any other form of discrimination, or to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure. Any educational opportunity offered by a school system must be available to students without regard to race, color, or national origin. In particular, any academic tests or other procedures used in assigning students to schools, grades, classrooms, sections, courses of study or for any other purpose must be applied uniformly to all students without regard to race, color, or national origin. Curriculum, credit and promotion procedures must not be applied in such a way as to penalize or hamper students who transfer from one school to another pursuant to a desegregation plan.

§ 181.13 *Faculty and Staff*

(a) *Desegregation of Staff.* The racial composition of the professional staff of a school system, and of the schools in the system, must be considered in determining whether students are subjected to discrimination in edu-

cational programs. Each school system is responsible for correcting the effects of all past discriminatory practices in the assignment of teachers and other professional staff.

(b) *New Assignments.* Race, color, or national origin may not be a factor in the hiring or assignment to schools or within schools of teachers and other professional staff, including student teachers and staff serving two or more schools, except to correct the effects of past discriminatory assignments.

(c) *Dismissals.* Teachers and other professional staff may not be dismissed, demoted, or passed over for retention, promotion, or rehiring, on the ground of race, color, or national origin. In any instance where one or more teachers or other professional staff members are to be displaced as a result of desegregation, no staff vacancy in the school system may be filled through recruitment from outside the system unless the school officials can show that no such displaced staff member is qualified to fill the vacancy. If as a result of desegregation, there is to be a reduction in the total professional staff of the school system, the qualifications of all staff members in the system must be evaluated in selecting the staff members to be released.

(d) *Past Assignments.* The pattern of assignment of teachers and other professional staff among the various schools of a system may not be such that schools are identifiable as intended for students of a particular race, color, or national origin, or such that teachers or other professional staff of a particular race are concentrated in those schools where all, or the majority, of the students are of that race. Each school system has a positive duty to make staff assignments and reassignments necessary to eliminate past discriminatory assignment patterns. Staff desegregation for the 1967-68 school year must include significant progress beyond what was accomplished for the 1966-67 school year in the desegregation of teachers assigned to schools on a regular full-time basis. Patterns of staff assignment to initiate staff desegregation might include, for example: (1) Some desegregation of professional staff in

each school in the system, (2) the assignment of a significant portion of the professional staff of each race to particular schools in the system where their race is a minority and where special staff training programs are established to help with the process of staff desegregation, (3) the assignment of a significant portion of the staff on a desegregated basis to those schools in which the student body is desegregated, (4) the reassignment of the staff of schools being closed to other schools in the system where their race is a minority, or (5) an alternative pattern of assignment which will make comparable progress in bringing about staff desegregation successfully.

§ 181.14 *Services, Facilities, Activities, and Programs*

(a) *General.* Each school system is responsible for removing any segregation and any other form of discrimination affecting students in connection with all services, facilities, activities and programs (including transportation, athletics, and other extra-curricular activities) that may be conducted or sponsored by or affiliated with the schools of the system.

(b) *Specific Situations.*

(1) A student attending school for the first time on a desegregated basis may not be subject to any disqualification or waiting period for participation in activities and programs, including athletics, which might otherwise apply because he is a transfer student.

(2) If transportation services are furnished, sponsored or utilized by a school system, dual or segregated transportation systems and any other form of discrimination must be eliminated. Routing and scheduling of transportation must be planned on the basis of such factors as economy and efficiency, and may not operate to impede desegregation. Routes and schedules must be changed to the extent necessary to comply with this provision.

(3) All school-related use of athletic fields, meeting rooms, and all other school-related services, facilities,

activities, and programs, such as commencement exercises and parent-teacher meetings, which are open to persons other than enrolled students, must be open to all such persons and must be conducted without segregation or any other form of discrimination.

(4) All special educational programs, such as preschool, summer school and adult education, and any educational program newly instituted, must be conducted without segregation or any other form of discrimination. Free choice desegregation procedures normally may not be applied to such programs.

§ 181.15 *Unequal Educational Programs and Facilities*

In addition to the changes made in student assignment practices under its desegregation plan, each school system is responsible for removing all other forms of discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin. For example, some school systems still maintain small, inadequate schools that were originally established for students of a particular race and are still used primarily or exclusively for the education of students of such race. If the facilities, teaching materials, or educational program available to students in such a school are inferior to those generally available in the schools of the system, the school authorities will normally be required immediately to assign such students to other schools in order to discontinue the use of the inferior school.

§ 181.16 *Attendance Outside School System of Residence*

No arrangement may be made nor permission granted for students residing in one school system to attend school in another school system in any case (1) where the result would tend to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure in either system, or (2) where such attendance is not available to all students without regard to race, color, or national origin.

§ 181.17 *Official Support for Desegregation Plan*

(a) *Community Support.* School officials must take steps to encourage community support and acceptance of their desegregation plan. They are responsible for preparing students, teachers and all other personnel, and the community in general, for the successful desegregation of the school system.

(b) *Information to the Public.* Full information concerning the desegregation plan must be furnished freely to the public and to all television and radio stations and all newspapers serving the community. Copies of all reports on student and staff assignments required under § 181.18 below must be available for public inspection at the office of the Superintendent of the school system.

(c) *Protection of Persons Affected.* Each school system is responsible for the effective implementation of its desegregation plan. Within their authority, school officials are responsible for the protection of persons exercising rights under, or otherwise affected by, the plan. They must take appropriate action with regard to any student or staff member who interferes with the successful operation of the plan, whether or not on school grounds. If officials of the school system are not able to provide sufficient protection, they must seek whatever assistance is necessary from other appropriate officials.

§ 181.18 *Reports*

(a) *Anticipated Enrollment.* By April 15 of each year, or by 15 days after the close of the choice period in the case of plans based on free choice of schools, each school system must report to the Commissioner the anticipated student enrollment, by race, color, or national origin, and by grade of each school, for the following school year. Any subsequent substantial change in anticipated enrollment affecting desegregation must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

(b) *Planned Staff Assignments.* By April 15 of each year, each school system must report to the Commissioner

the planned assignments of professional staff to each school for the following year, by race, color, or national origin and by grade, or where appropriate, by subject taught or position held. Any subsequent change in planned staff assignments affecting staff desegregation must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

(c) *Actual Data.* As soon as possible after the opening of its schools in the fall, but in any case within 30 days thereafter, each school system must determine and promptly report to the Commissioner the actual data for the items covered in the reports called for under (a) and (b) above.

(d) *Attendance Outside System of Residence.* The reports called for under (a) and (c) above must include a statement covering (1) all students who reside within the boundaries of the school system but attend school in another system, and (2) all students who reside outside but attend a school within the system. This statement must set forth, for each group of students included in (1) and (2) above, the number of students, by race, color, or national origin, by grade, by school and school system attended, and by school system of residence.

(e) *Consolidation or Litigation.* A school system which is to undergo consolidation with another system or any other change in its boundaries, or which is involved in any litigation affecting desegregation, must promptly report the relevant facts and circumstances to the Commissioner.

(f) *Other Reports.* The Commissioner may require a school system to submit other reports relating to its compliance with Title VI.

§ 181.19 *Records*

A school system must keep available for not less than three years all records relating to personnel actions, transportation, including routes and schedules, and student assignments and transfers, including all choice forms and transfer applications submitted to the school system. The

Commissioner may require retention for a longer period in individual cases.

[§§ 181.20 through 181.30 reserved]

SUBPART C—ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION PLANS BASED ON GEOGRAPHIC ATTENDANCE ZONES

§ 181.31 *General*

A voluntary desegregation plan based in whole or in part on geographic attendance zones must meet the requirements of this Subpart for all students whose assignment to schools is determined by such zones. The general requirement for desegregation plans set forth elsewhere in this Statement of Policies are also applicable.

§ 181.32 *Attendance Zones*

A single system of non-racial attendance zones must be established. A school system may not use zone boundaries or feeder patterns designed to perpetuate or promote segregation, or to limit desegregation or maintain what is essentially a dual school structure. A school system planning (1) to desegregate certain grades by means of geographic attendance zones and other grades by means of free choice of schools, or (2) to include more than one school of the same level in one or more attendance zones and to offer free choice of all schools within such zones, must show that such an arrangement will most expeditiously eliminate segregation and all other forms of discrimination. In any such case, the procedures followed for the offer, exercise and administration of free choice of schools must conform to the provisions of Subpart D below.

§ 181.33 *Assignment to School in Zone of Residence*

Regardless of any previous attendance at another school, each student must be assigned to the school serving his zone of residence, and may be transferred to another school only in those cases which meet the following requirements:

(a) *Transfer for Special Needs.* A student who requires a course of study not offered at the school serving his zone, or who is physically handicapped, may be permitted, upon his written application, to transfer to another school which is designed to fit, or offers courses for, his special needs.

(b) *Minority Transfer Policy.* A school system may (1) permit any student to transfer from a school where students of his race are a majority to any other school, within the system, where students of his race are a minority, or (2) assign students on such basis.

(c) *Special Plan Provisions.* A student who specifically qualifies to attend another school pursuant to the provisions of a desegregation plan accepted by the Commissioner may be permitted, upon his written application, to transfer to such other school.

§ 181.34 *Notice*

(a) *Individual Notice.* On a convenient date between March 1 and April 30 in each year, each school system must distribute, by first class mail, a letter to the parent, or other adult person acting as parent, of each student who is then enrolled, except high school seniors expected to graduate, giving the name and location of the school to which the student has been assigned for the coming school year pursuant to the desegregation plan, and information concerning the bus service between his school and his neighborhood. All these letters must be mailed on the same day. Each letter must be accompanied by a notice, in a form prescribed by the Commissioner, explaining the desegregation plan. The same letter and notice must also be furnished, in person or by mail, to the parent of each prospective student, including each student planning to enter the first grade or kindergarten, as soon as the school system learns that he plans to enroll.

(b) *Published Notice.* The school system must arrange for the conspicuous publication of an announcement,

identical with the text of the notice provided for under (a) above, in the newspaper most generally circulated in the community, on or shortly before the date of mailing under (a) above. Publication as a legal notice is not sufficient. Whenever any revision of attendance zones is proposed, the school system must similarly arrange for the conspicuous publication of an announcement at least 30 days before any change is to become effective, naming each school to be affected and describing the proposed new zones. Copies of all material published hereunder must also be given at that time to all television and radio stations serving the community.

(c) *Maps Available to Public.* A street or road map showing the boundaries of, and the school serving, each attendance zone must be freely available for public inspection at the office of the Superintendent. Each school in the system must have freely available for public inspection a map showing the boundaries of its attendance area.

§ 181.35 *Reports*

(a) *Attendance Zones.* The report submitted under § 181.18(a) by April 15 of each year must be accompanied by a map, which must show the name and location of each school facility planned to be used during the coming school year, the attendance zones for each school in effect during the current school year, and any changes in the attendance zones planned for the coming school year. The map need not be of professional quality. A clipping of each newspaper announcement and any map published under § 181.34 (b) or (c) above must be sent to the Commissioner within three days after publication and, in the case of proposed revisions, must be accompanied by data showing the estimated change in attendance, by race, color, or national origin and by grade, and in the racial composition of the professional staff, at each school to be affected.

(b) *Attendance Outside Zone of Residence.* Whenever a student is permitted to attend a school other than

that serving his zone of residence, and whenever a request for such attendance is denied, the school system must retain records showing (1) the school and grade applied for, (2) the zone of the student's residence and his grade therein, (3) the race, color, or national origin of the student, (4) the reason stated for the request, and (5) the reason the request is granted or denied. Whenever the total number of transfers permitted from any school exceeds two percent of the student enrollment at that school, the relevant facts must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

[§§ 181.36 through 181.40 reserved]

SUBPART D—ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR VOLUNTARY DESEGREGATION PLANS BASED ON FREE CHOICE OF SCHOOLS

§ 181.41 *General*

A voluntary desegregation plan based in whole or in part on free choice of schools must meet the requirements of this Subpart for all students whose assignment to schools is determined by free choice. The general requirements for desegregation plans set forth elsewhere in this Statement of Policies are also applicable.

§ 181.42 *Who May Exercise Choice*

A choice of schools may be exercised by a parent or other adult person serving as the student's parent. A student may exercise his own choice if he (1) is exercising a choice for the ninth or a higher grade, or (2) has reached the age of fifteen at the time of the exercise of choice. Such a choice by a student is controlling unless a different choice is exercised for him by his parent, or other adult person acting as his parent, during the period in which the student exercises his choice. Each reference in this Subpart to a student exercising a choice means the exercise of the choice by a parent or such other adult, or by the student himself, as may be appropriate under this provision.

§ 181.43 *Annual Mandatory Exercise of Choice*

Each student must be required to exercise a free choice of schools once annually. A student may not be enrolled or assigned to a school without exercising his choice, except as provided in § 181.45 below.

§ 181.44 *Choice Period*

A period of at least 30 days must be provided for exercising choice, to commence no earlier than January 1 and to end no later than April 30, preceding the school year for which choice is to be exercised. The Commissioner may require an additional period or different dates for a particular school system. No preference in school assignment may be given on the basis of an early exercise of choice during the choice period.

§ 181.45 *Failure to Exercise Choice*

A failure to exercise a choice within the choice period does not excuse a student from exercising his choice, which may be done at any time before he commences school for the year with respect to which the choice applies. However, any such late choice must be subordinated to the choices of students who exercised choice during the choice period. If by a week after school opens there is any student who has not yet exercised his choice of school, he must be assigned to the school nearest his home where space is available. Standards for determining available space must be applied uniformly throughout the system.

§ 181.46 *Letters to Parents, Notices, and Choice Forms*

(a) *Mailings.* On the first day of the choice period, each school system must distribute, by first class mail, a letter, an explanatory notice, and a choice form, to the parent or other adult person acting as parent of each student who is then enrolled, except high school seniors expected to graduate, together with a return envelope addressed to the Superintendent. The texts for the letter,

notice, and choice form to be used must be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner.

(b) *Extra Copies.* Extra copies of the letter, the notice, and the choice form must be freely available to parents, students, prospective students, and the general public, at each school in the system and at the office of the Superintendent.

(c) *Content of Choice Form.* Unless otherwise authorized or required by the Commissioner, each choice form, as prepared by the school system for distribution, (1) must set forth the name and location of, and the grades offered at, each school, and (2) may inquire of the person exercising the choice only the name, address, and age of the student, the school and grade currently or most recently attended by the student, the school chosen, the signature of one parent or other adult person serving as parent or, where appropriate under § 181.42 above, the signature of the student, and the identity of the person signing. If necessary to provide information required by §§ 181.18 and 181.19 above, or for other reports required by the Commissioner, the choice form may also ask the race, color, or national origin of the student. No statement of reasons for a particular choice, or any other information, or any witness or other authentication, may be required or requested. No other choice form, including any pupil placement law form may be used by the school system in connection with the choice of a school.

(d) *Return of Choice Form.* At the option of the person completing the choice form, it may be returned by mail or by hand to any school in the school system or to the office of the Superintendent.

(e) *Choices Not on Official Form.* Exercise of choice may also be made by the submission in like manner of any other writing which sufficiently identifies the student and indicates that he has made a choice of a school.

§ 181.47 *Prospective Students*

Each prospective student, including each student planning to enter the first grade or kindergarten, must be required to exercise a free choice of schools before enrollment. Each such student must be furnished a copy of the prescribed letter, notice, and choice form, by mail or in person, on the date the choice period opens or as soon thereafter as the school system learns that he plans to enroll. Each must be given an opportunity to exercise his choice during the choice period. A prospective student exercising his choice after the choice period must be given at least one week to do so.

§ 181.48 *Choice May Not Be Changed*

Once a choice has been submitted, it may not be changed for the school year to which it applies, whether during the choice period, after the choice period, or during that school year, except on request (1) in cases meeting the conditions set forth in § 181.50 below, (2) in case of a change of residence to a place where another school serving the student's grade level is closer than the school to which he is assigned under these provisions, and (3) in case of a compelling hardship. A student who cannot enter the school of his choice because the grade he is to enter is not offered at that school must be promptly notified as soon as this is known and must be given the same opportunity to choose another school as is provided a prospective student under § 181.47 above.

§ 181.49 *Assignment According to Choice*

No choice may be denied in assigning students to schools for any reason other than overcrowding. In cases where overcrowding would result at one or more schools from the choices made, preference must be given on the basis of the proximity of schools to the homes of students, without regard to race, color, or national origin. No preference may be given to students for prior attendance at a school if such preference would deny other students their

free choice of schools under the plan. In cases where this provision would result in unusual difficulty involving, for instance, students not being able to finish their senior year in a particular school, or students being unable to attend school with other members of the same family, or at a school having special courses required by a student, the relevant facts may be brought to the attention of the Commissioner for consideration of alternative procedures. Any student whose choice is denied under these provisions must be notified in writing promptly and given his choice of each school in the system serving his grade level where space is available. Standards for determining overcrowding and available space that are applied uniformly throughout the system must be used if any choice is to be denied. Each student and his parent, or other adult person acting as parent, must be notified in writing of the name and location of the school to which the student is assigned hereunder, promptly upon completion of processing his first or any second choice. A school system may, at its option, give preference to any student whose choice is for a school at which students of his race are a minority.

§ 181.50 *Transfers for Special Needs*

Each student must attend the school to which he is assigned under the foregoing provisions, except that any student who requires a course of study not offered at that school, or who is physically handicapped, may be permitted, upon his written application, to transfer to another school which is designed to fit, or offers courses for, his special needs.

§ 181.51 *No Limitation of Choice; Transportation*

No factor, such as a requirement for health or birth records, academic or physical examinations, the operation of the school transportation system, or any other factor except overcrowding, may limit or affect the assignment of students to schools on the basis of their choices. Where transportation is generally provided, buses must be routed to the maximum extent feasible so as to serve each student

choosing any school in the system. In any event, every student choosing either the formerly white or the formerly Negro school (or other school established for students of a particular race, color, or national origin) nearest his residence must be transported to the school to which he is assigned under these provisions, whether or not it is his first choice, if that school is sufficiently distant from his home to make him eligible for transportation under generally applicable transportation rules.

§ 181.52 *Officials Not To Influence Choice*

No official, teacher, or employee of the school system may require or request any student or prospective student to submit a choice form during the choice period other than by the prescribed letter, notice, and choice form. After the choice period, the school system must make all reasonable efforts to obtain a completed choice form from any student who has not exercised a choice. However, at no time may any official, teacher, or employee of the school system, either directly or indirectly, seek to influence any parent, student, or any other person involved, in the exercise of a choice, or favor or penalize any person because of a choice made. Information concerning choices made by individual students or schools to which they are assigned may not be made public.

§ 181.53 *Public Notice*

On or shortly before the date the choice period opens, the school system must arrange for the conspicuous publication of a notice describing the desegregation plan in the newspaper most generally circulated in the community. The text of the notice must be in a form prescribed by the Commissioner. Publication as a legal notice is not sufficient. Copies of this notice must also be given at that time to all radio and television stations serving the community. Any other announcement published by the school system concerning enrollment, such as might be made in connection with scheduling pre-enrollment procedures for prospective first grade students, must (1) state clearly

that under the desegregation plan a choice of school is required for each student whose choice has not yet been exercised, (2) describe and state where copies of the prescribed letter, notice and choice form may be freely obtained in person, or by letter or telephone request, and (3) state the period during which the choice may be exercised.

§ 181.54 *Requirements for Effectiveness of Free Choice Plans*

A free choice plan tends to place the burden of desegregation on Negro or other minority group students and their parents. Even when school authorities undertake good faith efforts to assure its fair operation, the very nature of a free choice plan and the effect of longstanding community attitudes often tend to preclude or inhibit the exercise of a truly free choice by or for minority group students.

For these reasons, the Commissioner will scrutinize with special care the operation of voluntary plans of desegregation in school systems which have adopted free choice plans.

In determining whether a free choice plan is operating fairly and effectively, so as to materially further the orderly achievement of desegregation, the Commissioner will take into account such factors as community support for the plan, the efforts of the school system to eliminate the identifiability of schools on the basis of race, color, or national origin by virtue of the composition of staff or other factors, and the progress actually made in eliminating past discrimination and segregation.

The single most substantial indication as to whether a free choice plan is actually working to eliminate the dual school structure is the extent to which Negro or other minority group students have in fact transferred from segregated schools. Thus, when substantial desegregation actually occurs under a free choice plan, there is strong evidence that the plan is operating effectively and fairly, and is currently acceptable as a means of meeting legal re-

quirements. Conversely, where a free choice plan results in little or no actual desegregation, or where, having already produced some degree of desegregation, it does not result in substantial progress, there is reason to believe that the plan is not operating effectively and may not be an appropriate or acceptable method of meeting constitutional and statutory requirements.

As a general matter, for the 1967-68 school year the Commissioner will, in the absence of other evidence to the contrary, assume that a free choice plan is a viable and effective means of completing initial stages of desegregation in school systems in which a substantial percentage of the students have in fact been transferred from segregated schools. Where a small degree of desegregation has been achieved and, on the basis of the free choice registration held in early 1967, it appears that there will not be a substantial increase in desegregation for the 1967-68 school year, the Commissioner will review the working of the plan and will normally require school officials to take additional actions as a prerequisite to continued use of a free choice plan, even as an interim device.

In districts with a sizable percentage of Negro or other minority group students, the Commissioner will, in general, be guided by the following criteria in scheduling free choice plans for review:

(1) If a significant percentage of the students, such as 8 percent or 9 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1966-67 school year, total transfers on the order of at least twice that percentage would normally be expected.

(2) If a smaller percentage of the students, such as 4 percent or 5 percent, transferred from segregated schools for the 1966-67 school year, a substantial increase in transfers would normally be expected, such as would bring the total to at least triple the percentage for the 1966-67 school year.

(3) If a lower percentage of students transferred for the 1966-67 school year, then the rate of increase in total transfers for the 1967-68 school year would normally be

expected to be proportionately greater than under (2) above.

Where there is substantial deviation from these expectations, and the Commissioner concludes, on the basis of the choices actually made and other available evidence, that the plan is not operating fairly, or is not effective to meet constitutional and statutory requirements, he will require the school system to take additional steps to further desegregation.

Such additional steps may include, for example, reopening of the choice period, additional meetings with parents and civic groups, further arrangements with State or local officials to limit opportunities for intimidation, and other further community preparation. Where schools are still identifiable on the basis of staff composition as intended for students of a particular race, color, or national origin, such steps must in any such case include substantial further changes in staffing patterns to eliminate such identifiability.

If the Commissioner concludes that such steps would be ineffective, or if they fail to remedy the defects in the operation of any free choice plan, he may require the school system to adopt a different type of desegregation plan.

§ 181.55 *Reports*

(a) *Supporting Materials.* Each school system must submit to the Commissioner a copy of the letter, notice, and choice form, all as prepared by the school system for distribution, within three days after their first distribution, and must submit a clipping of all newspaper announcements published in accordance with § 181.53 above within three days after publication.

(b) *Data on Choices Not Being Honored.* In any case, including the case of conflicting choices under § 181.42 above, where a student chooses a school where he would be in a racial minority, and (1) he is to be assigned to a school where he would be in a racial majority, or (2) the school system proposes not to process his choice for

any reason, the relevant facts must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

(c) *Transfers for Special Needs.* Wherever a student is permitted, under §§ 181.48 or 181.50 above, to attend a school other than the school to which he is or would be assigned under the other applicable provisions hereof, and whenever a request for such attendance is denied, the school system must retain records showing (1) the school and grade applied for, (2) the school and grade to be transferred from, (3) the race, color, or national origin of the student, (4) the reason stated for the request, and (5) the reason the request is granted or denied. Whenever the total number of transfers permitted from any school exceeds two percent of the student enrollment at that school, the relevant facts must be reported promptly to the Commissioner.

[§§ 181.56 through 181.60 reserved]

SUBPART E—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

§ 181.61 *How To Submit Reports*

Each report to the Commissioner required under this Statement of Policies must be sent by first class mail addressed to the Equal Educational Opportunities Program, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 20202.

§ 181.62 *Alternative Administrative Procedures*

If an administrative procedure provided for under this Statement of Policies is not administratively feasible in a particular situation, the Commissioner may accept an alternative procedure if he determines that it will accomplish the same purpose.

§ 181.63 *Revision of Statement of Policies*

The Commissioner may modify this Statement of Policies as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of Title VI.

§ 181.64 *Copies of Documents for State Agencies*

Each school system submitting any plan form or report to the Commissioner under this Statement of Policies must also submit a copy of such form or report to the appropriate State education agency.

§ 181.65 *Definitions*

As used in this part,

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the U.S. Commissioner of Education or any official acting under assignment or delegation from him to carry out any of his functions under this Statement of Policies.

(b) The term "discrimination" means discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin.

(c) The term "dual school structure" means a system of separate school facilities for students based on race, color, or national origin.

(d) The term "HEW Form 441" means the printed document provided for the use of certain school systems by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Assurance of Compliance with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Regulation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

(e) The term "HEW Form 441-B" means the printed document provided for the use of certain school systems by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Assurance of Compliance with the Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

(f) The term "HEW Regulation" means the Regulation issued pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Part 80, of Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations).

(g) The term "parent" means an adult individual who exercises parental control over, or is otherwise acting as parent of, a student or prospective student.

(h) The term "school official" shall include, but is not limited to, any person who serves on the governing board of a school system, or attends meetings of such board in an official capacity, and all administrative and supervisory personnel of a school system.

(i) The term "school system" means, as the context may require, either (1) a legally constituted school authority (such as a local board of education) which has administrative control of one or more elementary or secondary schools, (2) the geographic area over which any such school authority has administrative control for school purposes, or (3) the schools and facilities over which any such school authority has administrative control.

(j) The term "Statement of Policies" means this Revised Statement of Policies for School Desegregation Plans under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

(k) The term "Title VI" means Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (PL 88-352, 42 USC 2000d to 2000d-4).

[§§ 181.66 to 181.70 reserved]